THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

TOWARDS SOCIAL REFORM

THIRD AND POPULAR EDITION.

THE HEART OF THE EMPIRE.

Discussions of Problems of Modern City Life in England.

Large Crown 8vo, cloth, **3s. 6d.** net.

CONTENTS.

I. REALITIES AT HOME. CHARLES F. G. MASTERMAN, M.P.
II. THE HOUSING PROBLEM. F. W. PETHICK LAWRENCE, M.A.
III. THE CHILDREN OF THE TOWN. REGINALD A. BRAY, B.A.
IV. TEMPERANCE REFORM. NOEL BUXTON, M.A., and WALTER HOARE.
V. THE DISTRIBUTION OF INDUSTRY. P. WHITWELL WILSON, M.P.
VI. SOME ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM OF CHARITY. A. C. PIGOU, B.A.
VII. THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE. F. W. HEAD, M.A.
VIII. IMPERIALISM. G. P. GOOCH, M.P.
IX. THE PAST AND FUTURE. G. M. TREVELYAN, M.A.

T. FISHER UNWIN.

TOWARDS SOCIAL REFORM

BY

CANON & MRS. S. A. BARNETT

T. FISHER UNWIN

LONDON
ADELPHI TERRACE

LEIPSIC
INSELSTRASSE 20

1909

(*All rights reserved*)

HN
39
B26+
cop

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 9
CANON BARNETT AND MRS. S. A. BARNETT.

PART I

SOCIAL REFORMERS

SOCIAL REFORMERS: PAST AND PRESENT . . 19
CANON BARNETT.

CLASS DIVISIONS IN GREAT CITIES . . . 26
CANON BARNETT.

LADY VISITORS AND GIRLS 33
MRS. S. A. BARNETT.

UNEMPLOYED GOODWILL—(1) EDUCATION; (2) POOR RELIEF 52
CANON BARNETT.

30653305

PART II

POVERTY

PAGE

THE UNEMPLOYABLE 63
Canon Barnett.

THE UNEMPLOYED BEFORE THE ACT . . . 75
Canon Barnett.

THE UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN'S ACT AND ITS AMENDMENT 87
Canon Barnett.

WORK AND THE UNEMPLOYED. . . . 100
Canon Barnett.

THE PUBLIC FEEDING OF SCHOOL CHILDREN . . 106
Canon Barnett.

PAUPERISM AND INSTITUTIONS . . . 117
Canon Barnett.

THE VERDICT ON THE BARRACK SCHOOLS . . 124
Mrs. S. A. Barnett.

THE WORKHOUSE 151
Canon Barnett.

SOME PRINCIPLES OF THE POOR LAW . . 158
Mrs. S. A. Barnett.

PENSIONS AND MORALITY: AN ANTICIPATION . . 174
Canon Barnett.

PART III

EDUCATION

PAGE

HOOLIGANISM 181
Canon Barnett.

SPECIAL COURTS OF JUSTICE FOR CHILDREN . . 188
Mrs. S. A. Barnett.

AN "AD HOC" OR A GENERAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY 206
Canon Barnett.

LABOUR AND CULTURE 215
Canon Barnett.

A COLLEGE OF THE HUMANITIES . . . 221
Canon Barnett.

PUBLIC AUTHORITIES AND ART COLLECTIONS . . 226
Canon Barnett.

THE PLACE OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN EDUCATION 231
Canon Barnett.

THE BEGINNINGS OF TOYNBEE HALL . . . 392
Mrs. S. A. Barnett.

A RETROSPECT OF TOYNBEE HALL . . . 255
Canon Barnett.

SETTLEMENTS OR MISSIONS 271
Canon Barnett.

PART IV

RECREATION

PAGE

PRINCIPLES OF RECREATION 289
Mrs. S. A. Barnett.

HOLIDAY REFORM 299
Canon Barnett.

TOWN CHILDREN IN THE COUNTRY . . . 307
Mrs. S. A. Barnett.

TOWN CHILDREN AND COUNTRY INTERESTS . . 321
Mrs. S. A. Barnett.

PART V

HOUSING

THE GARDEN SUBURB AT HAMPSTEAD . . 332
Mrs. S. A. Barnett.

INTRODUCTION

Professor Henry Morley, lecturing many years ago in Whitechapel, remarked how progress, like a walk, depends on the use both of the far sight and of the near sight. Men must lift up their eyes to the distant prospect or they will have no heart to go on; they must also take note of the path at their feet or they will stumble and go astray.

The remark has been again and again illustrated. Socialists and Individualists seem now, for example, to be absorbed in the far-off view of the Socialistic ideal. The first are so attracted and the second are so frightened that neither pays sufficient attention to the next step before their feet. Socialists, looking as it were to a land flowing with milk and honey, insist on its immediate occupation: they will endure no desert journey, they will have no leaders who do not repeat their shibboleth, and they will take nothing at the hands of parties who refuse to call themselves by their name. Individualists, on the other hand, fearing a future when every instrument of production will be transferred to the State, reject any proposal, however good, which seems to move in its direction. They prefer Egypt with its limitations and suffering. Socialists and Individualists shut their eyes to immediate needs. Neither assist

as they might to make progress. Both are apt to forget that the far-off prospect is always more or less an illusion, something which has in it a truth, but a truth which is never realised in its detail, something which can be spoken of in the language of poetry and not in the language of science. The Israelites, for instance, found no land flowing with milk and honey; but the hard contest by which Palestine was conquered was the foundation of the wealth and peace which they enjoyed under Solomon. There is a golden age in the future. The eyes which are open may see it in different forms, but all—Socialists and Individualists—see something in the future which is better than the present. The pity of it is that, taking as literal fact the illusion of Socialism, both often refuse to do what is possible and practicable.

The writers of the following papers look on to a golden age when mankind producing knowledge will enjoy an earth producing fruit. They believe in progress to a future better than the present, and they—not as Socialists nor as Individualists—aim to suggest things which can be done at once.

The papers have been written at different times during the last ten years in the heat of immediate experience. They may seem to have more than one expression, but they have the same spirit. We start with faith in human nature, in its capacity to serve and to rise. We believe that this capacity may be helped or hindered by the action of laws, institutions, and opinions.

Men and women are sent into the world to be one another's servants. There is no satisfaction in health or wealth unless their possessors are concerned in

thought or in action for the common good. No one can be called "saved" who does not will to give himself to save others. We have not hesitated, therefore, to advocate methods and measures which make a call on this capacity for service. Labour-saving machinery is no economy if it reduces the application of human love to human needs.

We advocate, therefore, as steps towards social reform that people of knowledge, instead of sending missions to the ignorant, should themselves settle among them, and by serving them fan into brightness the dormant public spirit.

We advocate that children, instead of being sent to barrack schools or to camp, should be considered as individuals. It may mean more labour to find for each child a cottage with a pure home life and a neighbour with the will to befriend, than to establish an institution with its staff of officers and its rules; but it is this labour which increases the capacity for service and therefore increases most surely the resources of the nation. The people who have been called to think about the child and the child who has been thought about are all better members of society.

We exalt for the same reason benevolence which involves personal work and calls out for the recipients some powers of sacrifice. There is more and more truth manifesting itself in the saying that we only give in what we share. The subscription which keeps going some great institution stands on the same level as the tax which supports the schools; it has its value, but not the same value as the gift which represents thought and increases trust. The relief which prevents starvation is not

to be compared with the relief which enables the starving man to get strength to support himself. The pleasure which excites—which, starting from outside the man, stimulates his sensations, is not as real as the pleasure which, starting from within, kindles his whole being. It is better to teach people to enjoy themselves than to provide amusements, better to teach them to play than to watch others at play, better to give them a new interest than an empty holiday.

The suggestions thus assume every one's capacity to serve, they assume also the capacity of every one to rise to the highest. "The best for the lowest" is not the precept always held in repute by those who build churches or plan amusements for "East Ends," but it is that acted on by the greatest of social reformers. The dock labourer can admire pictures and fine music. The hooligan has power of adventure and dreams of heroism. The drunkard often drinks because his thoughts are too big for his place in the world. The beggar has in him the broken pieces of a self-respect which appreciates courtesy and resents contempt. Our suggestions follow, therefore, the line of putting the best within every one's reach. We would lay open the way to the enjoyment of beauty, of art, and of travel. We would nationalise luxury, and we would give to every one the high thing which he does not want. But with our belief in human nature we believe also in the power of environment over character. Suggestions towards social reform must therefore take account of laws and customs. Laws which once helped now hinder. The Building Acts, which have done much to secure health in the home, now impose ugliness on a whole

district. The land laws, which once protected the cultivation of the earth, now exclude many who would work. The poor law, which once stimulated the idle, now degrades many who would strive. The Universities, which once sent light and truth through all classes of society, now stand aloof from the great stream of national life. We advocate, therefore, changes which will substitute garden suburbs instead of slums, consideration for the poor instead of punishment, and such an extension of University influence that every worker may have a wider outlook on life. We would, in a word, limit State action wherever it interferes with the growth of manhood and womanhood in the nation, and enlarge its actions wherever it could assist that growth.

Education and not relief is the function of the State and also of those institutions of charity which have the character of State institutions. Relief is the property of individuals; it is subject only to the law of friendship, and is most helpful when the giving is so great a pleasure to the giver that it confers no obligation on the recipient. The State and great organisations have to educate directly and indirectly; and the true test of any proposal—be it a Bill for town planning, for pensions, or for the unemployed, or be it an appeal to establish an institution for cripples, or the sick, or holiday children—is, Does it bring out the powers of being in the people it reaches? Is it likely to increase the sum of peace and goodwill among men? The application of that test must condemn many existing institutions, but it will also demand a further expenditure which ought to satisfy even a Socialist.

We appear, therefore, in these papers neither as Individualists nor as Socialists, but simply as advocating actions which lie in the way towards social reform. We do not discuss the details of any ideals or of any far-off visions; we believe that somehow good will come, and we desire to unite all parties to use their near sight and do the next good thing which lies at their feet.

The retrospect which the collection of these papers has opened is encouraging. There has been movement—slow and very often in a zigzag way—towards social reform. The relief of the poor is more and more coming under the direction of mind, and the question of the unemployed has secured the attention of Parliament. The treatment of children shows more consideration for individual character. Schools have improved—not only structurally but also as centres of influence, and the teachers, released from the old bondage of payment by results, begin to show their freedom by taking more interest in the children, their health, their holidays, and their entrance into industrial life. Evening classes have become attractive by offering the knowledge which is in demand and are opening the way to a complete system of continuation schools. "The condition of the people" is better ever since the Dock Strike raised the position of the general labourer and gave him the self-respect which comes of a regular wage. His success promises to be the doom of the system of casual labour which still so widely prevails. The London County Council, by the devotion and honour of its members, has set a higher standard of public service, it has made houses more fit for habitation, opened ways to greater

intercourse, and by its care of its open spaces has given to people some taste for Country in Town. If the Borough Councils have disappointed the hopes of their creators, they yet do better than the old vestries, and as a rule by means of able medical officers have promoted health in their areas and reduced the death toll.

There has thus been movement in health and wealth, in education and in enjoyment. There has also been a movement in mind. Old authorities in Church and in State have been examined and many have been thrown aside. Old idols have been broken or recognised as "a piece of brass." Such destruction is a sign of progress even if for a time it encourages a spirit of violence. People impatient of what is wrong naturally become impatient to set up something better, and defiance of law becomes more common. But such use of freedom is only for a time, and the freedom which is weary wilfulness prepares the way for the service which is perfect freedom. There is movement, the question is whether there is force behind to carry it on to the end. Why do people care for social reform?

Is it that they may get their own rights—more freedom for their own class, and more comfort for themselves? If so, as Mazzini prophesied, and as results have shown, the movement will end in the establishment of another tyranny of the strong over the weak.

Is it because they are children of fathers who were bound by obedience to a Higher Will to do their duty? If so the impetus must grow less with every generation, and there will again come "an end of the age" such as the world has often ex-

perienced—a time of decadence when no one has faith or hope.

Is it because the people who want social reform feel behind their own selves some power greater than themselves compelling them to go forward? The character of the Divinity which shapes our ends and not His promises constrain conduct. Communion with the Just One, with the Spirit which is making all things good, and not any precepts ensure progress. Utopias and Republics, whether of Plato or William Morris, of Socialists or Individualists, are attractive visions, but they have never created the enthusiasm which conquers difficulties and calls out sacrifice. The Israelites knew that it was the will of the Righteous God, therefore they made a great nation, and the first Christians knew the love of God, therefore they made a society in which the strong cared for the weak. Religion, which is the consciousness in men's selves of a force higher and greater than themselves, is, in a word, the only power which makes men willingly surrender their rights and be persistent in well-doing, and religion has been the unfailing motive to social reform.

Democracy is now established. The working classes have the largest share in the government of the nation, and on them its progress depends. We have had the privilege of a somewhat intimate knowledge of many members of this class. They may be said to have the strenuousness and the modesty which comes by contact with hardship, and the sympathy which comes by daily contact with suffering. They as a class are more unaffected, more generous, more capable of sacrifice than members of other classes. They have solid sense and are

good men of business, but they cannot be said to have the wide outlook which takes in a unity in which all classes are included. They are indifferent to knowledge and to beauty, so they do not recognise proportion in things, and their field of pleasure is very restricted between sentiment and comfort. They have the simplicity which "is the chief ingredient of noble minds," but they have not the sense of moral responsibility which makes discontent with self. They have individuality of character, but it shows itself in reserve rather than in enterprise, and they suffer, as the great German Socialist said, from "Wantlessness." They prefer honest mediocrity to honest intellect, and would still vote for W. H. Smith rather than John Stuart Mill. Their actions are generous, but their philosophy of life is often of that shallow sort which says, "Does Job serve God for naught?" and they are open, therefore, to be captured by "a policy of blood and iron"; they are easily taken by popular cries, they are fickle and are easily made "the puppets of Banks and Stock Exchanges." They are sympathetic, but for want of knowledge their suspicions are soon roused, and they soon distrust their leaders.

The working class is the hope of the nation, and their moral qualities justify the hope; but they need religion—that knowledge of the All Loving and the All Good which will constrain them to be wide-minded and persistently-minded in social reform.

The danger of a democracy is lest, deprived of that impulse, that habitual watchfulness which accompanies the strife between the Few and the Many, it may settle down in a somewhat sordid comfort of arm-chairs and abundant food, and cease

to make progress. Religion, which means the constant impulse from God to seek higher things, will correct this disposition and keep every one on the watch to make a better self and a better State.

Self-government is itself no security against either a wicked or a foolish policy; it is only an instrument and may be turned to base uses by workers who are not themselves constantly inspired by the spirit of love, of justice, and of duty.

Religion is not the subject of any paper in the following volume, but underlying every paper is the faith that in the service of God may be found the best security for the service of men.

We issue the volume in the hope that our experience may be of some value to the people of to-day who both fear and welcome the sound of the changes which are coming up the avenues of the future. Faith in social progress is, as Lord Morley says, "faith in men, hope for men, and charity for men."

Towards Social Reform

PART I

SOCIAL REFORMERS

SOCIAL REFORMERS: PAST AND PRESENT.

An observer of the ways of two generations has knowledge which ought to be useful. The reformers he knew in old days were men who saw visions; the present reformers may be described as practical, scientific, efficient.

There is now no great cause which enlists the glowing sympathy of the young. "What movement is there into which we can throw ourselves?" was a demand made the other day by a group of men at one of our Universities, and there was no ready answer to meet the demand. The Churches seem to be standing for the rights of their sect rather than for duties to "all creatures great and small." The political parties are without ideas which make a claim on the more generous instincts. The leaders of opinion are before all things cautious. They urge deliberation, the importance of consulting experts and of considering possibilities. They

stand hesitating at the cross-roads; they are not, like Luther, driven to take one course. "Here I stand; I can do no other." They see the difficulties of every situation, and feel no force compelling them to dare for duty. The Macedonians have been massacred because the Turk as a landlord had rights. Thibet is devastated lest international equilibrium may be shaken. The people are impoverished by drink; betting facilities are permitted; children are neglected because the interests of some trade, some class, or some sect have to be considered. The loudest voice raised in a time of war and suffering is that which counsels caution and stops action. The leaders of opinion—ecclesiastical, political, and social—make no demand which reaches the people in whom the smoking flax—the spark which disturbs our clod—is waiting to be fanned.

There is no great movement because there is no vision. Past reformers believed in Co-operation, or Socialism, or Education, or Internationalism. They saw in their mind's eye society advancing by one of these roads to happiness or peace. They gave themselves body and soul to their cause. They were disappointed; and they passed from the stage amid the cheers of critics who mocked at their folly in thinking they could at once set up the kingdom of heaven on earth. They made mistakes; they did not take account of facts; they were not scientific; but it has been their energy and their sacrifice which have put to the credit of the last generation some reforms the value of which is hardly understood. They were disappointed that the end they hoped for was not reached, but it is

by their devotion that towns are more healthy, the poor better considered, and education improved.

Present-day reformers have no such vision. They may be practical or scientific, but they are a broken and a straggling host. Some meet their neighbours' needs with lavish gifts, not the handfuls of coals and rice which Kingsley condemned, but with cheapened food and lodging. Some proceed to build and endow institutions, hospitals, asylums, and schools, as if one-half of the community were called to classify, drill, and take charge of the other half. Some—a smaller number—spend weary days seeking into causes, analysing conditions, and forming societies. There is probably no less expenditure of money and no less personal work than in old days, but the efforts are less inspired. The reformers engaged have not an impulse which comes from a common source and aim. They play their parts, but "between the acts" there are "no glimpses of the eternal." There is a sort of deadliness in modern doings, and so the things done hardly make for progress as the things done by their fathers under the inspiration of a vision. Illusion, it has been often said, is necessary for progress. The modern reformer has no illusions. He is not on his way to a promised land, and so his doings in the desert will not fit himself or his nation for a higher calling than that of enjoying milk and honey. It is visions which make the movements into which the young long to throw themselves.

"Are there," it may be asked, "any signs of a vision taking shape?" It is hard to foretell what cloud small as a man's hand will cover the sky, but there are dull mutterings, blind blows, and half-

expressed aspirations which suggest that the next movement will be more straightly directed against property.

A better educated industrial class has become conscious of needs which the average wage cannot supply; a less educated property class has made an insolent and degrading use of wealth.

The working man does not wish to heave half a brick at the aristocrat; his attitude is less brutal, but, so far as the aristocrat is concerned, more dangerous. He despises the ways of smart people, their love of jewels and dress, and the triviality of their pleasures. He is disgusted with their bad manners, their extravagance on horses and dogs, their late hotel suppers, and their Sunday dissipations. His wrath is gathering at the power of the ignorant rich over trade and at the impertinence of fine ladies who buy votes with blandishments. He knows of uses for money other than his less-educated fathers knew. He would like to travel and to have books, he is conscious of a capacity to enjoy pictures and music, he feels a being within himself, claiming a larger arena in which to live—a spiritual being beating against the bounds set by patrons and parsons. He has learnt, moreover, to doubt the arguments by which property justifies its rights to exceptional regard. He wants to know why rent is a debt unlike other debts; why land is so protected when Free Trade and the open door are taught as a gospel; why 5 per cent. is a greater obligation in trade than the lives of the workers; why millionaires should receive national honours; why property should have one House of Parliament for its own security.

The working man is growing contemptuous of the reasoning and assumption of his superiors, while his passions are roused by the sight of increasing numbers of starving and degraded neighbours. He is puzzled by the sight of such wretchedness, but is often strangely ignorant as to its causes, and he is generally mistaken in his attempts to suggest or to give relief, but his feelings are right when they are roused to passion that such wretchedness should be possible within reach of such senseless and vulgar expenditure.

This more educated antagonism of working men to property is a fact, and, as usual, it has its reflection in the minds of other classes. There is thus evident in some of the deeper currents of University life a kind of impatience of the ways of wealth—a certain consciousness that the manners of rich society hinder intercourse between spirits which are akin; that fine eating is as injurious as gross drinking; that "helping" and "doing good" to the poor assume a wrong relationship; that money is not the best implement of reform; that wealth, indeed, and not poverty, is the national danger; that it is capital stored in one part of the Ship of the State which gives the ship the ugly list which prevents its making way on an even keel; that a simpler life is the better life.

There is among the educated as among the working classes a restlessness because of the tyranny of material things. The offers of wealth no longer satisfy the noblest aspirations; the neglected spiritual forces are asserting their existence; there is a strange readiness for excursions into the infinite, and there is a willingness to hear leaders

whose credentials are not "hall-marked." The things which wealth honoured are coming to be regarded as idols, and things recognised as idols are soon attacked.

Such are some of the signs which suggest the direction of the next great movement in social reform, but whatever be its direction it will doubtless be initiated by the organised and educated working classes. The danger is lest the reform being in the interest of one class may be injurious to all classes. An industrial party might be as short-viewed as a propertied party. It might be as arrogant and as self-satisfied. It might believe in protection for itself, it might cheapen the value of thinking and miss the spiritual object of national existence—that is, the raising of the whole people to the full enjoyment of their individual capacities.

The best safeguard against such a danger is the often-preached alliance between democracy and the Universities. The tyrants of Italy had a true instinct when they put Mazzini in prison, not liking talented young men who were thinking about Italian freedom. The advance of Co-operation and of Trade Unions in early days was secured by the associated service of working men and members of the educated classes.

The working-class organisations are now inclined to stand aloof. Their suspicion may perhaps have some justification, but self-sufficiency seldom sees clearly. The working men have not the knowledge which is gained in years of study—they have not learnt to take wide views, they are not in the modern sense scientific. Theirs is the power, but unless they take into their confidence the talented

young men and women who are thinking about the future and are "Pilgrims of the Invisible," unless they bind with their spirits the generous, clear-eyed spirits of cultured people, unless they are as human as past reformers and as scientific as present reformers, the vision which will inspire their great movement will be one which will lead the world in a weary circle in which rights clash with rights rather than onwards to a unity of classes made happy and strong by that which each member supplies.

1904.

CLASS DIVISIONS IN GREAT CITIES

Classes must exist. A body in which every member is a hand could do no work, and a city of one class would have no life. The classes in our great cities are many, but the terms "rich" and "poor," if not exact definitions, represent clearly enough the two great classes of society. Their unity means strength, their division means ruin. Disraeli, in "Sibyl: or The Two Nations," vividly sets out the dangers of division, and his book still makes illuminating reading.

The conditions during the last fifty years have indeed changed. The opposition between "the nation" of the rich and "the nation" of the poor is less blindly fierce than when Disraeli wrote, but the division may, nevertheless, be deeper. Different ideals are more disintegrating of society than incendiary fires, and organised parties are more effective instruments in destroying strongholds than riots.

The growth of these different ideals and the power to organise have followed the increase of wealth and the spread of education. The increase of wealth has led to the formation of extensive suburbs occupied wholly by the rich or by the poor. Small properties have been cleared away from the

neighbourhood of larger houses, the employers seeking sunshine have moved further "West," and have left the employed to accumulate in the less attractive, but not always uncomfortable, "East End."

The two classes have thus come to have their own local habitation in the city. Under the subtle influence of neighbourhood they develop their own tastes and pleasures; they form habits, manners, even a speech which become almost as distinctive as those of different nations, and many a workman would as readily call himself a Frenchman as wear a dress-coat.

The two classes have, as a consequence, different ethical standards. By one class kindness or good fellowship is recognised as the highest qualification in a candidate for office, by the other class capacity or efficiency is most valued. Workmen, it may be said, are better able to feel deeply than to think clearly, while the richer classes think clearly rather than feel deeply. They neither know, nor always care to know, one another as individuals, and their conversation often shows fundamental ignorance of one another's habit of mind. The rich think of the poor as people to whom missions must be sent, who must be amused to be kept from public-houses, and safeguarded from dangerous opinions; and the poor think of the rich as self-indulgent and idle. This ignorance creates suspicion, and actions on either side intentionally simple are often by suspicion turned to mischief.

The increase of wealth has broken up the old close relationship of rich and poor, sending them to live apart and think apart. The spread of educa-

tion has at the same time given the poor the means of defining their differences and organising their strength.

There are thus two ideals of society and two parties set on reaching these ideals. The rich, represented by its own political organisations, is chiefly concerned for the defence of property; the poor, represented by the Labour Party, is chiefly concerned for the interests of labour. Each class, ignorant of what is in the hearts and heads of other citizens, formulates its own object and seeks it as an absorbing duty.

The classes are divided, and the effect of the division may be seen in legislation and philanthropy. Parliament and local authorities come to be regarded as arenas in which each class struggles for its own rights. One's gain is held to be another's loss. A proposal by either at once arouses the other's suspicion, and the resulting action is the familiar weak compromise. Class pulls against class. Each has its eye on an ideal in which its own members are dominant, not one in which all the citizens get equal benefit. So it is that the Housing, Temperance, Education, and Poor Relief questions remain unsettled. At one moment it is the property class which, fearful of its rights, interposes restrictions on the acquisition of land which make healthful buildings impossible; at another moment it is the representatives of the poor who insist on municipal housing, on out-relief, or on other actions which hinder individual growth.

Philanthropy, affected by the same class divisions, is sometimes mischievous. The rich, willing to be generous, but ignorant of the mind of the poor,

often offer a charity which offends self-respect. Their relief funds, doled out in pity or contempt; their missions as from those above to those beneath; their orphanages, in which individuality is crushed; their entertainments, in which the higher aspirations for beauty are forgotten, all tend to irritation; while the poor, suspicious that no one does good for nothing, are apt to regard the gifts as ransom. Hence comes the tragedy of charity, which, meaning to do good, does ill.

The problem before us is how to set a city of many classes on raising, not one of its parts, but the whole. How may rich and poor learn to consider one another and work for some common end? How may the human flickering instincts of respect and sympathy be cherished so that they may fuse into one body the men and women divided by their interests as employed and employers? How may pride in the city—its beauty, its health, its happiness—take the place of pride in the dominance of one class? The problem presses. Our "unhappy divisions" are more serious as each class becomes more powerful, and as the nation takes up new responsibilities. The internal strife covert and unconfessed may destroy the common wealth and wreck the hopes of empire.

I would offer some suggestions towards the solution of the problem.

I. The first and most obvious is that rich and poor should live in closer neighbourhood. There is no reason in the nature of things why the houses of the poor should be mean and disfiguring of the prospect. In these days of "garden cities" it is easy to imagine how, in the constantly growing

suburbs of our towns, there should be large and small houses both equally pleasant in appearance.

But even in cities as they are, there is no adequate cause why some of the richer classes should not live among the poor. They might come as families or as individuals. The effect where a few have done so, as in Toynbee Hall and other Settlements, is very striking, not so much by their good works but by the great influence of their lives. Men and women who are every day in contact with poor neighbours, who see them as they go about the streets, who hear their casual talk, and who meet them on local business, slowly and unconsciously bring about a change in their own views and in those of their neighbours. The influence of neighbourhood is very subtle. I find for myself that when I am living in the country I cannot speak and write about the poor as I can when I am living in Whitechapel. If the rich and the poor dwelt in one another's neighbourhood they would feel more sympathy with one another's ideals, and individuals, by forming friendships here and there outside their own class, would see through the medium of a friend that the other class is better and more human than they had known. They would begin more naturally to think of a city which all can enjoy and all co-operate in making.

II. Another suggestion which I would offer is simpler living for the rich and higher thinking for the poor. Luxury is rapidly extending, and is a great divider. The habit of fostering every whim or of out-doing neighbours in extravagance of furniture and food is anti-social. It was, I think, Dean Farrar who told a tale of a man who built

for himself a fine house, and in his dining-room set up a luxurious chimney-piece. When he saw it, he reflected, and ordered as a motto, "Peter stood and warmed himself." It is luxury which goes before denial of duty. The motto might with advantage be written on many modern habits. Luxury, in so far that it increases the feelings which make divisions, is a greater social danger than even drunkenness.

Workmen, on the other hand, resent higher thinking. Their boast is to be "practical"; they ask for education to fit them for higher wages, and they spend their wages on increased comforts. They have not got, and do not want, the imagination which would enrich their leisure and help them to respect their opponents. Their indifference to their engagements, the noise and disorder of their pleasures, their narrowness of mind, tend to keep them as a class apart. Simpler living and higher thinking would bring rich and poor nearer together; but if higher thinking is to be common, the best in knowledge and beauty must be within every one's reach. Libraries, Art Galleries, good music, University teaching, must be as near to a West End as to an East End suburb. There can be no real unity so long as the people in different parts of a city are prevented from admiring the same things, from taking the same pride in their fathers' great deeds, and from sharing the glory of possessing the same great literature.

III. The last suggestion I would offer is that fuller teaching should be given about the character of God. The God Who is now offered for worship does not constrain the worship of people who

breathe a mental atmosphere loaded with the discoveries of science and history. The God preached to the poor is indeed hardly the same God as that preached to the rich, and yet all classes of people share the thought of the age. Among the Hebrews a new revelation of the Divine character preceded each development in their social life, and in Christian ages a new thought about God has gone before the great revolutions of society. Religion always directs the strongest current of progress. The need of the moment is a presentment of God in Christ, formed out of contemporary experience; a conception which even the indolent will feel to be true, and such a widespread knowledge of the Divine character as will compel a common worship. Acts of uniformity, attractive services, a Gospel adapted to the lowest intelligence, will not avail to bring about such worship, but only a fuller knowledge of God, Who is daily revealing Himself in modern works and modern thoughts.

One way to that knowledge, let us own it with gratitude, is now open in many a parish through the unselfish, humble, holy life of its minister. God always speaks from His throne in the humble heart. The knowledge might, however, be more widely spread if all ministers would throw on to the Bible the light which students have placed in their hands and would teach theology in relation to science. Religion is, I submit, the one force which can turn the various and often antagonistic classes into fellow-workers, making our great cities good for the habitation of both rich and poor.

1904.

LADY VISITORS AND GIRLS

This paper was written for a meeting of ladies already enrolled as workers of the Association for Befriending Young Servants. But, as it will probably fall into the hands of many who are not connected with the Association, it might be as well to briefly explain the nature of the work, and how the girls whom we visit come under our care.

The Central Council of the Association is in communication with many of the Pauper Schools, and as the girls are sent to service from the schools, they are placed by the Guardians under the care of the Association. If the Association has a branch office in the district where the girl is living, she is placed under the care of that branch, and the lady visitor living nearest the child-servant, and most likely to gain an influence over her, is furnished with her name, address, and such particulars as are known, and is asked to visit and report on her. Each branch has also a free Registry Office, to which girls who could not otherwise obtain a situation apply for help. These girls, when once settled in service, are also placed under the care of a lady, and it was for the purpose of describing the work of these lady visitors that this paper was written and read.

When a lady receives one of the well-known papers or notes asking her "to visit and report" on Jane Smith or Louisa Robinson, her first feeling is one of repugnance to going and calling on the servant at one of her neighbour's houses. Her first objection, which I fancy few of the Honorary Secretaries have not heard many times, is, "But surely the mistress will object to my interfering with her servant. I am sure I should not like it in my own case"; or, perhaps the lady goes as she is requested, and her report runs thus: "I saw Jane Smith for a minute or two in the hall. I could not judge about the suitability of the situation, but the girl looked healthy and said, in answer to my question, that she was happy"; or, "I went to see Mrs. Jones, Louisa Robinson's mistress. She did not give a very satisfactory account of Louisa; neither did she seem quite to understand my visit; but she was polite and gave me permission to see the girl. I did not, however, like to stay long. Louisa seemed sullen, and I did not get much out of her."

I keenly sympathise with the visitor who can give no other report but such as these, and I doubt not that they will agree with me that they are very unsatisfactory, if not worthless. The mistress, not understanding anything about the Association, feels that she is being interfered with; the girl (and this is particularly bad if she happens to be a pauper girl) gets the idea that she is being watched and, as they say, "things told" of her to the lady, and thus, at the beginning, a barrier has grown up between the possible friendship of the lady and the girl. It is these difficulties which have led us to adopt and suggest another way of breaking the ice.

On receiving the name of a new girl, it is a good plan for the lady to write to the mistress, asking permission to call on her, if possible naming the day and hour, and giving as an explanation of her proposed visit that she is a member of the Association which has placed the girl in her service; or, in the case of a pauper girl, she may state that the Guardians have placed the girl under the care of the Association of which she is a visitor.

The first visit should, I think, be made strictly to the mistress. In some cases, if the mistress offers it, the lady may see the girl, but it has been found better to ask the mistress to allow the girl to call upon the visitor, to accept an invitation to tea, or to join a class. In some way it is better to plan the first meeting (by far the most important) so that it may be outside the routine of the girl's daily life, and not in any way connected in her mind as a possible addition to the frequent "rowings," to use her own word, which she already gets from her much-tried mistress.

As a rule, when properly prepared by a judicious note, the mistress receives the lady cordially, looks upon her as an assistance in the management of her servant, pours into her ears (we hope not such unwilling ones) a tale of woes as long as the Ancient Mariner's, and asks her to rebuke her servant for all the faults which she either has not the courage or the force of character to attack. In many cases she receives the lady gladly as a friend to her girl, as one to whom she can turn to bring some brightness into the life of the hard-worked little maid, for whom the mistress has an honest liking, and whom she herself would make

happy if her means were not limited by poverty, ignorance, a large family, and much work. In either case, permission for the girl to visit the lady, or for the lady to repeat her visit to the girl, is generally given, and that granted, the work is—*only* to hold the girl, to win her heart!

It is not a difficult task this to win a girl's heart—in the case of the pauper girls, a touchingly easy one. The girl, brought up in an enormous school, with teachers to teach, nurses to nurse, mistresses to order, no one to love; launched into the world at an age when the heart and mind are awakening into life, when the capability for joy or sorrow is most keen; sent out into a bewildering world, as Mrs. Browning says—

> "Suddenly awake to full life and life's needs and agonies,
> With an intense, strong, struggling heart"—

so ignorant of life's common ways and ordinary conditions, that right gets confused with wrong; so painfully new to all the surroundings that the newness hurts; with no past to help the future; no memories of a wise, tender mother, whose words of counsel must now be taken, having before been proven true; with no practical knowledge of principles which *must* be clung to whatever is abandoned; with no friend bound up with childish joys—*only* a school in the past. It is the heart of such a girl, empty because no one has cared to fill it, which is given over to the lady to win; and it is this girl, whose character comes to us as "sullen, obstinate, and sly," whose eyes at the first word of kindness fill with tears—tears hitherto rarely summoned except by physical pain—it is this girl,

whose interest once awakened, lives on the memory of your words, to whom you can become, in an awe-inspiring way, a conscience.

And the methods are, in themselves, so simple.

"What can I talk about?" asks the visitor. "When she has told me she is well and happy, then the conversation ends."

No! it need not. There is the history of her daily life to be told—the hour she gets up, the work she has to do, the number, names, and ages of the children, where they go to school, which she likes the best, stories of their naughtiness, when the lady might give suggestions of how to manage them, the difficulties of her work—and so on, until the history brings her to bed-time, which not unnaturally leads to a little talk about the evening prayer, a duty which the tired girl often neglects, feeling it does not matter, or which she scrambles over irreverently, so as to make what should be her greatest help a harmful form.

Then there are the savings to discuss, and it has been found most helpful if the lady will herself take charge of the girl's money. Let her begin soon, even if with only a shilling, and shortly other shillings join it, and the girl, aided by the visitor's encouragement, rarely comes out without something more being added. Sometimes it is better to let a girl begin saving by laying by for one particular thing—say, a good winter's cloak—but after a little time saving will go on for its own sake, and habits of thrift will be inculcated.

Not unfrequently our visitors write to us: "Mary, Jane, or Louisa has left her place, and I don't know where she has gone to." But it is a fact, in our

experience at least, that, excepting in one case when a girl left 2s. 4d. in my hands, the visitor has never lost sight of a girl who has begun to save with her. Besides saving, the whole question of the spending of the girl's money is one in which the visitor may well interest herself. In the case of the pauper girls it is very important, as I have known girls leave the schools not knowing the relative value of 1s. and a 6d. In the cases of other girls it is almost equally as important. As a rule, our girls get from £7 to £10 a year. Even the most economical can hardly save more than one-fourth of this, but the better the other money is laid out the more she will be able to save.

Many complaints are heard from the mistresses of the flashy style of dress of their maids, but much of it comes from ignorance; and if the visitor will take the trouble to consider the girl's dress, to suggest to her the colour and style of her new gown, and recommend her the shop where she can buy her hats, the girl gratefully responds, and the dress is taken fresh care of, to please her lady friend. Sometimes, if the visitor has time, it is a good plan to take the girl shopping herself, when her greater experience can guide her in the choice of stuffs; but if this be impossible I have found it helpful to keep a bundle of patterns, and many a time have we solemnly gone through these patterns, not unfrequently ending with "I'd rather have one like yours, please mum."

But it is not well always to talk of the girl's own affairs. It should, I think, be the visitor's duty to give the girl a wider view of life, to interest her in other people's aims, to teach her to care for

those whose lot is sadder and more full of pain than her own. Wholesome books naturally suggest themselves, and as the mistresses object to much reading at a time, a monthly periodical may be the best means of giving the girls food for their minds. They can easily pay for it themselves, and if the lady will get it for them and let them fetch it from her house, a fresh link is made, and regular reading is insured. *Sunday at Home* or *Day of Rest* do for the better educated; *Sunshine* for the more childish; and even the pretty pictures of the *Children's Friend* are a source of pleasure and interest to those who can't read. If a girl is unable to spare the 4d. a month, she might share the magazine with two or three of the other girls; the lady arranging the change, drawing lots for it at the end of the year, or giving it to the subscriber who has kept her place the longest.

One lady tried to interest her girls in the little cripples, inducing them to spend their spare pence and their spare minutes in knitting little woollen cuffs or scarves, and taking the girls to see the objects of their charity. I remember once a girl, an old friend of mine, coming to call on me just as I was starting to see a poor child in the hospital. I took her with me, chiefly that we might have a talk on the way. I was struck by the sympathy which the sight of the sick child aroused. The girl at once asked me if she might give him money, and has since never ceased to inquire about the welfare of the little sick one; so readily come the kindly feelings if once aroused! Another lady found that she greatly interested her girls by sending them Bible questions, and offering a prize to the girl

who, at the end of the year, answered most of them rightly.

But, besides all these little things, which I must almost apologise for mentioning, so small and self-evident do they seem, there is the all-important matter of the girls' holidays. For the girls who have fairly decent homes, it is quite easy to arrange. They can come and see their friend first, leave the savings, have a little talk, and go on to spend the day at home; when, if one is doubtful of the home, it is sometimes a good plan to tell the girl to call on the visitor, if possible, at a fixed time in the evening, when, under the excuse of sending a bunch of flowers or a message to the mistress, or of hearing the account of the girl's day, or of seeing the new purchases made, the visitor can assure herself that the girl can be back in good time at her place.

But the most difficult cases still remain. A pauper girl arrives at your house at eleven in the morning. "Emily Smith has come to see you" is announced. After a little talk—"Well, Emily, how long have you got to-day?" "Oh, Missus said I need not be home till ten" is the answer. Eleven hours of pleasure to be got through by an ignorant girl, in high spirits, dressed in her best, ready for any fun, and our streets full, as they are, with every sort of temptation for the unwary. Their right use needs careful planning, but how it repays! One girl, who, alas! I had not known till her conduct had put her outside the reach of our Association, said, on telling me of the success of one of these long days, and of all she had seen and learnt—"Yes; I'm sure if I had had all this to think of before, I should not have gone wrong."

Terribly true; and it was not money which prevented her having these simple pleasures: not time; not thought—no! All the capabilities of enjoying—all the consequent need for pleasure, were there, only she knew no lady who would give ten minutes to planning her day, who would take interest in her simple enjoyments.

Eleven hours to fill rightly with pleasure does sound like a difficult task, but we must remember that the lives of most of these girls are so barren of enjoyment that a very little amuses them. The history of the long day which called forth the remark I have just quoted was simply this: Minnie arrived about eleven. She and I then had a little talk. We went thoroughly into the wardrobe question. I advised the purchase of this under-garment, and objected to two things being bought "cheap" with money which only sufficed to buy one good one. She then went out to shop, returning about two. I offered her dinner, but she was too excited to care for much food, and the mention of cake tempted her more than the regular meal. I then wrote out for her the trains she was to take, the money she was to pay, and where she was to get out, and sent her off to the Zoological Gardens. She came back to me about seven, had some tea, told my maids, my old nurse, and my helpful Ellen (I being out) all her day's experience, and went off in good time to her place, tired with healthy exercise and pleasure.

She journeyed that day from Lambeth to Whitechapel—from Whitechapel to Regent's Park—back to Whitechapel and home. The sole expense to her was 1s. 4d., and not the least part of the

pleasures of the day were the rides in the omnibus and train. The gay, busy life of the streets, so safely seen and enjoyed if the girl has a destination; so dangerous if she is only "hanging about"; the little incidents about the fellow-passengers; even the advertisement pictures are a source of interest to those barren and idea-less lives.

But it does not do to send a girl to a public place of amusement every month. The novelty wears off and a taste is engendered for public amusement which might not end in such innocent places. But how else can one amuse these girls? One friend of mine who, living in London, has yet a garden with all its means of pleasure, told me, with great kindness, that I might send my girls up to her ever and anon for a day, "when she would make life for one day, at least, worth living," a real genuinely valuable invitation, and an example which, perhaps, other ladies, prevented from, or having a distaste to, becoming visitors, might follow. The girl could spend the day with the servants, or have a game with the children of the family, would see a new house, with probably prettier things than she is usually surrounded with, would get a glimpse into the life of another family, and, anyhow, would pass an innocent, harmless day.

But many of the ladies working for this Association, and some of the most valuable, are from family or other reasons prevented from having the girls to their own houses. The visits to the girls must then be periodically kept up, and, indeed, in some cases, it is found (particularly when the girl is self-willed and not inclined to avail herself of the lady's friendship) to be the best plan to con-

tinue visiting the girl. The effect of these visits on the mistresses has in some cases been very good. Some of the mistresses, seeing the interest taken in the girls, have altered their tone and feeling towards them. Others have become greatly interested in the whole work of the Association, and have shown that interest in a practical way by taking girls with difficult faults into their own homes. But though it is without doubt a great barrier to the growth of friendship between lady and girl, when a lady is unable to receive the girl into her own house, it is one which need not hinder a lady from becoming a visitor. There are many places of common meeting-ground. The lady can tell the girl where she sits at church, can ask her to come to the same aisle, can speak a few words to her after the service, or can, perhaps, walk a little way with her on her way home. On holidays, the visitor might plan to meet the girl in some place like the National Gallery, or the British Museum, where an hour spent with her in explaining the many incomprehensible things to be seen might go a long way towards winning her heart. More too can be done by correspondence than need be when more personal intercourse is possible. A birthday gift, showing memory of the birthday; the unexpected receipt (following the postman's knock) of a gift of a pretty card or little picture; letters telling the girl something of the lady's own interests, describing her travels, or speaking of the doings and characters in the tale which both are reading in the magazine; with an occasional party, when the lady might invite all the girls under her care to go together for a long walk in the country,

to the Wax Works, or the Crystal Palace, getting tea at a coffee tavern, or, if occasion serves, at some friend's house; all these are insignificant things, but these are they which make the difference between the condition of a Friend*less* girl and a *Be*friended one.

But all that I have hitherto said refers only to girls in their places. I have yet to speak of the visitor's duty in the not unfrequent incident of a girl changing her place.

"I am sorry to tell you," writes a visitor, "that Louisa Brown's mistress says that she cannot keep her any longer; she is so careless, dirty, and idle that she must part with her. She is to leave on Tuesday week." And then comes the usual request —"Will you get her a place, as you have so many more facilities than I have?"

Quite true! we, in the Office, have more opportunities of placing a girl; but suppose that we do take her to try and get her a place, we have only the character, which, as given by our correspondent, could hardly get the girl a place. We do not know all the past efforts to do better as her lady friend does. We do not know the weak spots in the situation, which has hardly allowed the girl a fair chance; we cannot tell from past knowledge of her scrupulous honesty, of her kindness to children, or of her love and care for the baby when it was ill. Things which the mistress has openly, in past times, acknowledged to the visitor, but which, now that she is tried and worried by the girl's carelessness and dirty ways, have gone (the mistress being only human) rather far into the background of her mind. We also do not knowwhere the girl wants strengthen-

ing, which influence should be weakened, which work would be better for her, as her friend does. We can only take the rough estimate of her character, and, speaking hopefully, on account of her youth, be gratefully glad if we can get any mistress to take her.

How much better, then, for the lady to place the girl herself. She may so far use the Office as to get the letters of a mistress who has applied for a servant, and then either call or write fully ; or she may answer advertisements, explaining her position with regard to the girl, being careful always that the new mistress should not accept the visitor's character of the girl, instead of taking it up in the usual way. She may thoroughly interest the new mistress in the girl, so that she, in her turn, becomes her helper, and any way the difficult introduction between the two ladies is made, and the visitor takes her legitimate place without further trouble.

The situation got, a fresh difficulty arises. The girl leaves her old place—say, on the Tuesday—and does not go into her new one till the following Monday. With homeless girls it is a great difficulty where they can lodge, but there are many good Servants' Lodging Houses, and if any one of these is not considered desirable the clergyman of the parish or the Charity Organisation Society's Agent will be able to tell of some decent old widow who will, perhaps, for a shilling a day, house and feed the girl. The good of this introduction by no means ends here. If the person is nice, and the girl takes to her, she becomes another friend, her house is one where the girl can, perhaps, pay a visit during the long day out, and her

influence, if good, is very strong, as the girl feels she she is one of her own class, and knows all about "things" which ladies, however sympathetic, can hardly understand. Here, too, the girl may meet respectable men of her own class, and this brings me to a large and difficult branch of my subject. I mean "lovers."

Girls of this, as, indeed, of every class, are very taciturn about their lovers, but little signs indicate to the watchful friend the existence of an absorbing thought, and then no false feeling of delicacy should prevent the visitor from gaining the girl's confidence. Sometimes the girls are very haughty towards their lovers. One girl was telling me about a man who had proposed to her.

"And do you like him?" I asked. "Yes, ma'am; but I won't have him." "Why not?" was my surprised question. "The other day we were talking about having no home, and he said 'poor girl.' I thought he wanted to marry me out of pity, so I won't have him," was the unexpected answer. Not often, though, is the feeling so dignified. Generally, the girls pick up a lover very lightly, and treat him, and allow themselves to be treated, with far too much familiarity. One of my girls introduced a young man as her lover, and giving many and urgent reasons for their hasty marriage, asked for all the savings in my hands to buy the new home. I talked for some time to the proposed bridegroom, counselled waiting and more saving, but all counsel was unavailing, they would have the money and begin at once. The girl appeared, in tears, in the evening. Her lover had told her to wait outside a shop, had gone in, and, she supposed, out by the

other door, for he had never appeared. We waited a fortnight for the unfaithful man, but as he had not then been, I sent for the girl, and asked her his full name and address. She declared she did not know, and I honestly believe she did not, so lightly had she picked him up, so little had she thought of marriage with any earnestness.

But both of these are extreme cases. In most instances the girl keeps company with a lad for some time, in the hope of ultimately marrying him, and the visitor's duty in these cases is not easy. She must feel enough sympathy with the girl to allow her to confide in her about her lover; she must not fail to speak plainly about the possibility of the temptations into which acquaintance with the man may lead her; and on these subjects the friend must not, I think, wait to speak to the girl until she opens the subject with her. It is not like girls of our own class, whose ignorance about sin we foster for fear of losing their innocence. These girls, alas! many of them with naturally coarse minds, and with a morbid curiosity about things which, not being told, they think they must "find out," are conversant already with all the terrible facts of life. Conversant, unhappily, with a sense of wrong; for never having been spoken to openly by any one they respect on those subjects they get the notion that they ought not to know such things, and enjoy talk and fresh information about them as a stolen pleasure. How much better, then, for the lady friend to tell the girl who already knows the horrors, the true and beautiful side of the relations between men and women! Let her speak plainly about marriage (at present, with them, a

subject only of giggling), and the possibility of the girl entering into it; tell her to avoid the rough intercourse which she would term "larking" with men, on which she would look back with shame when respectably married; and urge her never to take up with men who speak to her in the street, or who get to know her in her daily visits to the public-house to fetch "master's" beer. (This last is a practice which the visitor might ask the mistress to discontinue.)

But, at the same time, we must be careful not to discourage the girl's acquaintance with a man, even if he does not come up to the standard which we, caring much for our girls, would wish. The result will only be that the girl keeps up her man acquaintance and gradually shrinks from her lady friend, or commences a system of deceit which makes an unbreakable barrier between them. As a rule, if the girl cares for her friend, she brings her lover for approval.

One girl came asking me to make inquiries about her young man, for she could not find out what he was, "and you will know, you know, ma'am." A clairvoyant power, which, alas! I did not possess! Another girl brought her lover to be "talked to" before he went back to his regiment, and a third was so very glad I was pleased, for she said, "I had not been quite comfortable about it all the time you was abroad, and I could not write about that."

But dealing with lovers is comparatively easy compared to the difficulty of a girl's relations. The lovers are new, and can be refused without harming the girl's sense of duty. We cannot so deal with her relations. Her mother, however undesirable,

is her mother still, and we dare not break lightly the divinely ordained relationship. For the girls own good we are often led to wish the parents were "removed to the utmost parts of the earth," but that feeling must not appear, and, perhaps, is not right; and it will require all the tact and patience which we can summon to deal with the different complications which arise from this matter. Sometimes it is best to arrange for the girl to pay a regular weekly sum out of her earnings to her mother; this will prevent the mother constantly annoying the mistress by visits; sometimes the girl can supply some regular luxury, say, the father's tobacco, or the little brother's Sunday suits, which is just enough to show her interest, and keep the child in remembrance, that she is "one of us still," as they say. Sometimes it is necessary to counteract the mother's influence, and by offering the girl higher interests to gradually wean her from her home; but rarely is this necessary, oh! so rarely, that, in all the experience of our Office, it has not occurred ten times that we have had to break the holy tie between child and mother.

In one case, where the mother kept a bad house; in another, where the mother's greed for money to spend on vicious pleasure would have made her sacrifice her child's whole future; in a third case, where the mother was mad, and the girl, already weak-minded, was rendered absolutely will-less by her presence. In these three only have I felt it my duty to counsel, and to act, so as to break off sharply the old and lovely bond of relationship. But, in other cases, and they are many, the lady must seriously consider the question of the girl's relations

with her home, being careful not to forget that sometimes the girl, living a better life, having higher interests, may be the one good influence in the parents' lives, may, though all unconsciously, be in the covetable position of "turning many to righteousness."

One girl I knew of who, being herself kept up by the loving watchfulness of her young visitor, was the means of so lifting her family that, from being drunken, noisy "ne'er-do-weels," they became respectable (rough and low class still), but yet respectable members of the Temperance Club. Instances though of such evident influence are very rare; but the tie is there, it is Heaven-ordained, and we should hold our hands lest, in our anxiety to heal the world's wrong, we roughly sunder two whom God has joined together.

I must thank you for having listened so kindly to me. To myself, feeling the importance of the work, my suggestions have seemed "flat, stale, and unprofitable,"—far below the possibilities of the subject; for the work we have in hand has an almost infinite future. Prostitution is the great sin of our great cities, and it is from this class of young servants that it mostly takes its recruits. This is our enemy. Friendship is our weapon. Our enemy is mighty, our weapon mightier, and our girls saved from this is not our only work. In the persons of the 3,000 girls under our care, it is given to us to hold the future of a large number of the working classes. The ideas which we now instil into the girls' empty minds are the ideas which they, in their turn, will teach their children, and by which they will guide their husbands. It is

given to us to make some women brighter and better. It is given to us to bind classes together; not the least important part of our work now, when each class says to the other, "I know you not; and the unknown is most likely bad." It is given to us to hand over to some sunless lives a little of the joy which is so plentifully bestrewn round our own. It is given to us to help the sorrowful, to ease the pain of loneliness; "to guide, counsel, and command" the unloved of the earth. It is given to us to teach the friendless a little about love, without which they cannot know God, whose Christian name is "Love"; and this is the meaning in part, though not in whole (as those have borne their girls on their hearts will bear me out in saying), this is a part of what is meant when we are asked "to visit and report" on plain Maria, Mary Jane, or Susan.

1890.

UNEMPLOYED GOODWILL

I. Education

People of goodwill abound. Many of them are able, experienced in administration, well educated, and familiar with affairs. There are men who have been engaged in the Civil Service or in business: there are women who have gone through University courses or some special training as nurses, teachers, or housekeepers. Many of them have leisure, and their goodwill makes them anxious to serve their generation. They may not all be ready to solicit votes at an election, but there is a pressure of candidates ready to act as magistrates, as members of Royal Commissions, as aldermen, or as co-opted members of local authorities and distress committees. They are unemployed. Their own sense as well as the warnings of the wise keeps them from trying the old ways of charity. They will not play the Lord or the Lady Bountiful; they will not be irresponsible meddlers in their neighbours' affairs; and they will not serve on charitable committees whose mind is apt to change at every meeting and whose strength depends on popular subscription. They remain unemployed, and when they hear of poverty,

of ignorance, and of sickness their goodwill cries out, "Who will show us what to do?" and because they get no answer they often do nothing, except give, with a more or less doubting mind, a donation to some fund or some society. But is there nothing they can do? Is, for instance, the County Council, with its officials, sufficient to do all that is wanted for the management of schools and hospitals? Are the Boards of Guardians dealing in the best possible way with their great establishments for the poor?

The officials are, as a rule, admirable. They bring to the service of the community a knowledge and a devotion which during the last thirty years have greatly raised the level of local administration. If the choice lay between administration by some elected member of an *ad hoc* body and that by some highly qualified official, there is no doubt which is best for the community. The member of the old School Board had, as a rule, neither the knowledge nor the time to guide the affairs of the schools of his district. His irregular appearances and the absence of any proportion between his regard for some "fad" and that for the principles of education often made his interference contemptible. The Guardian who is apt to think that his knowledge of his neighbours justifies a claim for relief and his walk through the wards of the workhouse a guarantee against mismanagement costs the community a great sum both in money and reputation. It has been soberly argued that—such are the abuses which attach themselves to Guardians' administration of relief—officials should be put in the place of existing Boards. Officials have knowledge which experience is always enlarging; they

form together a compact body, and they are able to carry through a continuous policy. There is better order under their management, and when they have to justify themselves to representatives of the man in the street there is the best guarantee that their policy will be both orderly and progressive. The members of an elected body are not well qualified for administration, but they are admirably qualified both to inspire and control the expert whom they employ.

Officials, however, are bound to be mechanical, and yet the machinery with which, as servants of local authorities, they have to deal is human. They carry through a policy which is well designed to make men happier, but they cannot commend the policy as man to man or make every one of their subordinates carry to the farthest extremity the pulse of thought which started from their own hearts. The administration of the official is apt to become rigid—more and more rigid as it is strengthened to prevent possible abuses and as the officials themselves are less and less called on to justify their doings to a committee of plain people. There is a real danger lest administration under the County Council should become thus rigid—the area administered is so vast, the interests so varied, and the time of members of the Council so occupied. The danger might be avoided by the use of the unemployed people of goodwill.

The Council is responsible for the education of Londoners—primary and secondary. Its officials are elaborating schemes which are full of promise and are preparing for their effective execution. Their aim is efficiency, and they will probably reach

their aim. But the best teachers working under the best system cannot do all that is possible in a school. There is no school which is exactly like another school; there are diversities of teachers and diversities of children. There are neighbourhoods where the people are indifferent about education, and there are neighbourhoods where they are less indifferent. Men and women of goodwill acting as managers could discuss with the teachers how to adapt the system to the needs, and they could bring to the officials a knowledge not otherwise gained. They could commend education to the parents, and, speaking with authority, stir up an interest which would show itself in more intelligent voting. They could, that is, make a public opinion enthusiastic for education, whereas a mere official system is likely to make it antagonistic. They could form committees in elementary schools which would undertake all those duties to children which are coming to be recognised as necessary. They could secure that visitors should see to the health and cleanliness of each child, procure the special medical treatment, the convalescent home, or the country holiday, and influence the parents to send the child to good work rather than to well-paid but hopeless work as messengers or errand-boys. Managers have in the past done much in complementing the duties of officials, and they might do more. Men and women, however, of character and ability will not be attracted unless they are offered a recognised position. They must hold delegated authority from the Council, have definite responsibilities, and form a body to whom the officials might justify their doings. The

objections that managers are often unwise—that they would not be responsible to the ratepayers, and that elected representatives cannot delegate their power—are more or less technical objections. Managers carefully selected on account of their known capacity are not likely to be more unwise than members elected for no very obvious reason. They are, as a matter of fact, more likely to feel their responsibility, and in some instances have indeed saved the situation. The co-opted members of Mr. Long's Committee on the Unemployed were among those who gave the most regular and valuable service; and nominated members have again and again constituted the strength of Boards of Guardians. The Council could as honourably delegate authority to a carefully selected body of fellow-citizens as to a carefully selected expert. It would, indeed, in the former case watch the use made of its authority, as it could not in the case of an official whose words and acts would not be on record.

The Council has a government to administer which is of vast dimensions and closely affecting such human institutions as schools and asylums. It has at its command a highly skilled and honourable body of officials. It is able to consider the general proposals of those officials and approve their schemes. It is not able to consider the more special proposals; it cannot even interview responsible but subordinate officials, and the officials cannot do more than rigidly carry through its plans. London has the choice of three methods of government: (1) authority might be divided among various representative bodies; (2) it might reside in one

central body, which would leave all administration to capable officials; (3) the central body might utilise the unemployed people of goodwill.

The last obviously includes the greater number of advantages. The single authority, co-ordinating the powers and controlling the expenditure, is retained; the officials have room for the exercise of their knowledge and they are also in touch with bodies of qualified citizens whose sympathy will keep them human even where it sightly hinders the speed of their actions. There would be government by officials and not officialism. The London Council, by refusing to co-opt members on an education authority, by refusing to delegate its authority to local bodies, and by attenuating the powers of managers, may secure to itself the shadow of control; but the substance must pass to officials. There are men and women waiting now—as in England they have always waited—to serve the State without reward. Their service would make administration both efficient and human. They must, however, be given responsibility.

II. Poor Relief.

Poor relief in London seems as if it must be muddled through by local Boards or be efficiently administered by officials from a Central Authority.

It may be said for the local Boards that their errors are human. The people who suffer from their mistakes know that they often come of goodwill and can be remedied. The members of the Boards are known in other relations; their actions are always more or less in touch with public

opinion; and every neighbour feels that he has in some measure a share in his own government. But to a generation which is becoming more and more used to scientific methods the muddle is almost unendurable. The diversities of administration, the out-relief in Poplar, the restriction in Whitechapel, the cellular system provided for casuals in one Union and the associated system in another, are seen to perplex the poor. The reduplication of establishments, the absence of classification, the enormous sums spent on institutions, the unfairness which imposes on a locality charges which should be borne by the whole community, and the failure to give satisfactory relief are inclining opinion to favour proposals for substituting a Central Authority for the Boards of Guardians.

A Central Authority would, of course, mean administration by officials. It is to be said for officialism that officials bring both knowledge and devotion to the service of the public. They would soon make order out of the muddle. They would think out and carry through a system of relief—the best for children and the sick, for the able-bodied and the loafer, for the feeble-minded and the aged. There would be no more of those vagaries in which Boards indulge when, led by some enthusiast, they break the law to relieve their neighbours, or spend £250 a head in supplying children with appliances which hinder their development. There would be no room for good-natured Guardians to do little kindnesses out of the rates and set up in a district an epidemic of claims for relief. Good officials, acting for a Central Authority, would co-ordinate the institutions, allotting one for the care of one

disease and another for another; they would classify the inmates of the workhouses so that moral contagion might not spread; men and women wanting rest would be secured rest, and those needing discipline would be given discipline. They would secure for the children what their needs demanded, and make it impossible, as is now the case, for 22,000 children to be in the Workhouses and Infirmaries.

Much may be said for officialism which appeals to modern sentiment; but, on the other side, there is no doubt that officialism multiplies machinery, tends to become mechanical, and, worst of all, alienates public interest from public duty. The only effectual safeguard is that an official shall constantly be called to justify his ways to a body of ordinary citizens. It may not be that this body—this Committee—would actually control him, but the necessity of commending his schemes to living men and women would keep him human, make him his own critic, and draw to his proposals some public interest. The chief officials of a London poor relief authority commending their schemes to a body of men and women might thus save themselves from becoming mechanical, and secure some London sympathy for the care of London poor. But many important officials—the heads of establishments—the controllers of relief, could not come into touch with this one Central Authority. Their numbers would be too great, and the time of the authority too limited. The alternative, therefore, of local Boards seems to be more or less uncontrolled officialism.

Such a prospect damps the indignation at the present muddle. Order itself may be gained at too

great a cost, and the most perfect mechanism must fail to fit into human society. It would be a bad day for London if no one were interested in the poor; mistakes are often better than neglect. The prejudice against officialism is fully justified, and the strength of England as against Germany is in some way due to what England gains in its muddling through.

The obvious question, however, is whether this alternative be necessary. Must the choice lie between the officialism of a Central Authority and the muddling of local authorities? The answer I submit is "No," if unemployed people of goodwill be used. The experiment of delegating authority to elected bodies—as to borough councils—has not been altogether successful. Such bodies are not sufficiently subordinate, and do not work out the system initiated from the centre. Bodies created by the Central Authority, existing by its will and receiving definite powers from its hands, could not be thus obstructive.

The London County Council, supposing it became the central poor-law authority, in touch with officials of the highest class, could elaborate its system of poor relief, which would extend over its six million constituents. It could then appoint managers either of each institution or for each class of inmates. There could be managers for children, for the sick and infirm, for the feeble-minded, and for the various classes of the able-bodied. These managers could be selected from the many men and women whose goodwill is longing for action. Some of them work with charities, and are either fretted by their restrictions or run into extravagances very harmful

to any system of wise relief. Others are standing aside waiting a call from authority, ready to serve the State, but not an irresponsible "charity." All have knowledge and interest.

A strong body could easily be gathered from people of all classes of society—men of business and men of thought, working men and working-men's wives. Such a body could, for example, be entrusted with the management of the children's institutions. An official appointed by the Council would be present at its meetings, as an official appointed by the Viceroy sits at the meetings of the Calcutta Municipal Council. Nothing would be undertaken outside the general principles laid down by the Central Authority, and no direct interference in administration would be allowed to individual members; but every matter concerning the children would be brought up for consideration. The various officials would be seen and their reports heard. Regular visits would be paid and suggestions invited. Many actions would be taken, and any difference of opinion between the managers and the responsible officials would be brought fairly and squarely before the Council.

Delegation something on these lines could be widely extended. The Council would thus have time free to consider and lay down principles of government, and the men and women acting as managers would clothe the principles in personality. The system would not be mechanical and the officials would be kept human. The poor in the institutions would feel themselves still part of the community—the care not of officials but of fellow-citizens and, perhaps, neighbours. They would be

restored to self-respect not by "privileges," by improved diet or dress, but by human friendship. The neighbours, hearing of what was being done, meeting day by day the men and women responsible for the management of the institutions, would take more interest in social questions. They would ask "why" and "wherefore," and would become more intelligent and more sympathetic voters at elections.

The great danger to officialism is the sudden antagonism of public opinion. The best-thought-out plan might at any moment be upset because the people have had no part, direct or indirect, in its making. Officialism working through and with people of goodwill might avert this danger. The cost of a little delay while these people are being shown the best way, the endurance of a few mistakes in the working of the machine, is a small price to pay for security. The administration of poor relief must be scientific and it must be human. The end can hardly be reached unless the people of goodwill are used. To refuse their service is to miss the greatest force at governors' disposal. To let it flow uncontrolled is to invite waste and mischief.

1905.

PART II.

POVERTY

THE UNEMPLOYABLE

The problem of the unemployed is confused by the presence of the unemployable. Perhaps, if some way could be discovered of dealing with the latter, the working classes themselves could find a way of dealing with the former. The unemployable are the men and women so mentally or physically weak as to be unfit to earn a living. They are the untrained, the untaught, and the dissipated. The numbers tend to increase because the development of trade is always raising the standard of the worker —more intelligence is required for doing the least skilled work,—and because methods of relief suggested on the assumption of misfortune in the applicants are often an inducement to idleness or dissipation. There is no doubt, for instance, that many of the men thrown out of work by slackness in the building trade have had the power to lay by considerable sums out of the exceptional income of previous years.

The recognition of the distinction between the unemployed and the unemployable is the first step in the solution of the problem of their relief. The unemployed ought to be left to their friends and

to the trade unions. The unemployable it is both the interest and the duty of society to undertake.

These are the workers who reduce wages to starvation rates. They tempt employers—offering them cheap and inefficient labour; and live on alms in time of distress. They have to be supported; the work they do others could do; the charity they receive consumes the wealth of the land, and, shocking though it be to say such things of men created by God to think and do original work, the extinction of the unemployable would add to the wealth of the country. Mr. Booth truly remarks that this lowest class preys on the class immediately above itself.

These also constitute even a greater danger to the well-being of society, if that may be distinguished from its wealth. The sight of their manifest distress, in times of crisis or in spells of bad weather, rouses workmen to passionate indignation, and sets philanthropists and legislators on hurried action. Their presence gives force to every scheme of maudlin charity or of wild suspicion. Kind-hearted people, pointing to their needs, demand gifts of free dinners and unrestricted out-relief. Talkers, moved by unlimited suspicion, have it in their power to say, "This condition is what comes of free trade—or of property—or of monarchy." A degraded class lowers the standard of humanity, making it hard to enforce the lesson, "Honour all men." Its existence encourages many neighbours to say, "Nothing can be done," till their hearts are hardened, and their thoughts take shape in lucid expositions as to the uselessness of any effort. The well-being of society is affected when one set of its members is roused by the sight of suffering to use

angry and bitter words which alienate sympathy, and another set is either driven into indifference, or to start remedies which, like Mansion House funds, shelters, free meals, and relief-works, tend to increase suffering by offending the self-respect of the poor, by encouraging inability, and by attracting applicants.

There is still one other reason why society should, in its own interest, undertake the care of such vagrants, these shiftless, homeless men and women. They are the means by which contagion—moral and physical—most rapidly spreads. It is they who carry about disease. In one year's epidemic of small-pox, the greater proportion of cases occurred in the lodging-houses frequented by such people. It is their children who, playing truants, make other children truants. School officers returns show how bad is the attendance of shelter children. The cost of the unemployable to society is to a large extent represented by the millions of money yearly spent on industrial schools, or on small-pox and fever hospitals, or on all the machinery of police and inspectors which is kept up in order to prevent the effects of neglect and dirt.

Society is thus, by its own interest, bound to undertake the care of the unemployable, and it is bound by the greater bond of duty. The weak, be they weak by their own fault or by some one else's neglect, are members in the body corporate. They are in one sense its chief concern, and can only be left to perish when the nation as a nation has denied its obligation to humanity. The duty lies on the community to do something for men and women who are not worth a living wage. Every revelation that thousands of such people may be found while

statistics show increase of national wealth, is a summons to a society which calls itself by a common name and owns to being a brotherhood. It needs no prophet to foretell that if a society disowns an acknowledged duty it must meet loss and humiliation.

What, then, can be done for the unemployable, which will meet their need and is practicable? It is obvious that the only radical cure is to be found in better health and better education. Happily, this is being recognised. A public opinion is being formed which requires that there shall be better houses, more open space, greater attention to children's diseases, and more efficient sanitary precautions. Public opinion is gradually awakening to the importance of education which is not limited to the knowledge of reading and writing. It is seen that efficient earning depends on intelligence, and that intelligence in work depends on the activity of the mind in its recreation. Schools, therefore, are being made more interesting, children's curiosity is being stimulated by nature-study, continuation schools offer attractions, free libraries, picture galleries, and music are now often provided. Churches are realising that individuals must be reached by individuals, and are developing in a modern sense the ideas of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Much is being done, but it has hardly entered the public mind to conceive what will have to be done before the means of a healthy life and a cultivated mind are brought within every one's reach. Nevertheless, till this is done, there will be no radical cure for the unemployable.

But there is a blessed impatience in human

nature which will not be put off with the excuse, "Nothing can be done for the present generation, give all your attention to the children." The question, therefore, still presses, What can be done for these thousands of men and women whose health has been broken, whose minds are enfeebled, and whose characters are gone? What can be done for the people we ourselves see, whose sorrows call out our gifts or provoke our anger? What can be done at once?

The theory which at present occupies the field is that "deterrence" is the most efficient agent in forcing men and women to find employment. The theory has, of course, much which can be urged in its support. "An attractive form of relief is too great a temptation for ordinary human nature, and rapidly develops pauperism," is the text of some most able pamphlets, and many reformers contend that any scheme must be wrong if it offers the poor an "eligible" maintenance. The effect of this theory has been that in workhouses and casual wards labour has been made "deterrent." The inmates are forced to break stones, to pick oakum, or to do some work by purpose made hard and disagreeable so as to "deter" them from again resorting to the house. The man who enters an "improved" casual ward—which is the latest product of the deterrent theory—is locked up in a cell with a heap of stones which he is left to break up small enough to pass through a grating at the end of the cell. He is treated as a felon, and he is forced to do work under the conditions of distrust and loneliness most abhorrent to human nature. Is the theory right? Is a prison-like garb, a prison-

like sort of work, a prison-like system of control, a vexatious system of rules, a stigma attached to the name of pauper, solitary confinement—is mere disagreeableness a means of reform worthy a civilised community? In a barbaric state the law is "an eye for an eye," but in a civilised state such a punishment is considered brutal, and the wrong-doer is treated as one to be educated. In our prisons the schoolmaster and the trademaster take the place of an executioner; and, instead of a brand, the criminal at the end of his term receives the wages he has earned in his prison. The "disagreeableness" with which poverty is punished seems as if it were a relic of the barbaric stage, and the poor have surely as much right to be educated as the criminal. Brands and bullyings will not drive people to work, any more than the giving of an eye for an eye will drive a criminal to righteousness. The policy which has followed the deterrent theory is, indeed, as unreasonable as it is cruel. How is it likely that men and women, for whom work has been made shameful and deterrent, will afterwards seek work? How does such treatment fit the weak, the weary, the unskilled, or even the discontented, to do better work? There are few sadder sights than that which meets a visitor to the casual wards in London, as groups of his fellow-beings turn on him sullen, alien, and resentful faces. Casual wards invent more dangerous aliens than foreign nations can land on our shores. The theory which holds the field is wrong. It is not deterrence, it is education or training which will make people work; and education, be it remembered, includes discipline.

The first thing necessary, therefore, is to replace

the workhouses and casual wards with what may be called "labour schools"—a "school of restraint" for men and women, and a "school of freedom" for men only, at which, under certain conditions, there would be freedom to come and go. Both schools should be established in the country, so that there would be ample provision for space, air, and exercise; but both should offer facilities for variety of work indoors as well as on the land. The control would probably be more efficient if the governors were appointed partly by the County Council and partly by the Local Government Board. The area for the selection of governors, as well as for the admission of people, would thus be wider than that of poor-law unions, and it might be well to dissociate the new schools from old associations. Part of the expense might fairly be borne by the nation, as the unemployable cannot be said to be the creation of any one locality or, indeed, to have any settlement. The Local Government Board would thus have the right to nominate certain of the governors, and would take advantage of their power to put on men and women of known intelligence and humanity.

The "school of restraint" would be for men and women who, broadly speaking, being homeless, apply for relief. These people are now liable to restraint during certain hours in the casual wards, which may extend over two days. The period of such restraint would have to be further extended, so that after, it may be, the second or third application it should cover three or four years. The inmates of the school would be well fed, enjoy outdoor exercise, have the means of education, receive medical atten-

tion, be educated, and be freed from all vexatious or humiliating treatment. They would, above all things, be trained in such work as would enlist their interest; infinite care both by officials and voluntary visitors would have to be given to individuals to discover and awaken such interest.

Experience has, for instance, proved that wayward men, whose weakness or virtue it is to like new things, will quite eagerly work at laying out a new garden, designing its paths and its beds, looking forward to Nature's co-operation with their labour. The lowest, we may rejoice, "are allied to that which doth produce and not partake, effect and not receive." A spark disturbs every one's clod. Work which touches the dormant creative faculty is thus unexpectedly satisfying, and gradually educates kindred faculties. Other men and women have been shown to have an art sense which delights in decorative work, and many have had their whole nature roused by the care of animals until work has become a pleasant habit.

The school would supply every inducement to bring out capacities, using the discoveries which the study of human nature will from time to time put at its disposal. It would aim at curing by development rather than by repression, by attracting rather than by deterring. But it would be a "school of restraint," in so far that, during the period of detention, there would be no going outside its wide boundaries, and the inmates would have to work.

The "school of freedom" would be for men who, broadly speaking, have established homes of their own, having by their industry made enough money

to buy furniture and keep their families. It would be set up, either in barracks or in huts, on a broad acreage of unreclaimed or derelict land, of which we are told there is in England an undue proportion. The men—and, for obvious administrative reasons, no provision would be made for women—would be put to work, and money sufficient for the full upkeep of their homes sent by sure hands to their wives. The work given, either on the land or indoors, would be fitted to the respective abilities of the workers, but would never be made degrading either by its associations or conditions. A man would be under no compulsion to stay in the school, but he would be asked to commit himself for a certain period, and, in case of breaking this commitment, would have to make special terms if ever he required re-admission. There would, however, be free permission for each man, at regular intervals, to visit his home and seek work for himself, without losing his right to return or the pay for his family during his two or three days' absence.

Hope would, in a word, be the universal lever, as fear is now the lever. But hope must have a definite form. Perhaps it might be possible that part of the general work of the school should be the building of small homesteads and reclaiming the surrounding land to fit it for gardens. The hope of occupying as State tenants such homesteads and gardens might then be held out to men who proved their qualifications for country life, or the offer of a free passage to the colonies might be made to others who had fitted themselves for emigration.

There are people in England, it must be recognised, who will never support themselves in the

open market. They are either physically or mentally weak; they have, perhaps, been broken under the wheels of civilisation. These people, in the protection of a community, might live quiet lives, and produce at any rate something towards the support which, in some way or other, society has to provide. The management of such communities would be full of difficulties, but it ought not to be impossible to bring up to date the old idea of a "workhouse" in which men and women might live as human beings, at such a level as human sentiment recognises as fitting.

But to return to the proposed labour schools as means of dealing with the unemployable. They will be likely to be more efficient, as they are more human, than the deterrent means at present in operation. They will provide influences and appliances necessary to the health and progress of the inmates. They will offer work by which men might strengthen themselves, keep up their homes, and develop the country's wealth and happiness. They will also, by requiring that the inmates live in seclusion, impose a test which would keep a man from lightly throwing himself on the rates. What loafer would endure to be sent from the town, with its varying excitements, to face the possibility of education in the dull country? The loafer hates, above all things, the thoughts of being improved; and the "school of restraint" would be even more distasteful to him than the workhouse, where, at any rate, he has the fun of resisting the master's efforts to make him take his discharge. On the other hand, what honest poor man would not gladly endure loneliness, dulness, and

work if, at the end, he could see himself able to earn a living and to save his wife and children?

The indoor test, as it is called, may have been discredited by the humiliations imposed in workhouses, and by the character of the work imposed; but in principle it is right. There is no other condition by which to prevent the abuses which always attach themselves to relief works—such as the slack effort, the preference for provided over sought employment—or to the accumulation of labour where it is not wanted; and there is no other condition by which a solid determination can be proved and a weak will straightened. Such schools as I have suggested would offer an indoor test which is at once efficient and human.

It may be well, in conclusion, to put together what it is contended are the obvious advantages of the proposed scheme for meeting the needs of the present unemployable in a practical way.

1. The scheme is no new departure in the relief of the poor. It is rather the adaptation of an old system to meet the demands of a more humanitarian age. Workhouses and casual wards already exist, but they are modelled on the lines of prisons. It is proposed that they be remodelled on the lines of schools.

2. The scheme opening to every one a door of hope, there would no longer be reason for shelters, free meals, and casual relief. People of goodwill are now unable to endure the sight of the poverty that exists, and they sympathise with the objection to go to the workhouse, from which no one comes out better fitted for work. They give, therefore, the sort of relief which experience has shown to be fatal to the poor, as it saps their self-respect,

relaxes their energy, and makes them gamble with their lives for the chance of a dole. Good-hearted people will never stop that relief so long as the casual ward is the only resort of the applicant, and till they stop such relief the unemployable will go on hanging to the skirts of our civilisation. They will, it may be believed, stop such gifts when they know that there are schools of restraint or of freedom, open to every one, where each person would be certain of human treatment, and be given a chance of self-help.

3. The scheme would relieve the labour market of a body of people who constantly interfere with the rate of wages, and the charitable public of applicants who constantly divert gifts from beneficial objects.

4. The scheme, while its chief object is the improvement of the individual, would use such labour as he can offer for the common good. One of its results would therefore be that some waste land would be brought into cultivation.

5. The scheme opens a new avenue for personal service. The people isolated and secure in these schools would be ready for the friendly guidance of visitors able, out of the resources of their heads, their hearts, or their purses, to give needful help. Long experience has shown that it is only "one by one" that the mass of human beings can be raised; and it may be claimed to the credit of this scheme that it would so break up the mass of the unemployable that each one might be reached as an individual by an individual, and each one brought within reach of the personal force of that friendship which is stronger than teaching or discipline to renew weak wills and make the unemployable useful members of society. 1903.

THE UNEMPLOYED: BEFORE THE ACT

"THE Unemployed" is a symptom of a deeply seated disease. Modern trade with its demand for the best labour pressing hardly on the less fit, the unintelligent, and the weak; the careless charity of a society too self-indulgent to face the trouble of being just; an out-of-date Poor-Law machinery which often rouses ill-will rather than effort, have contributed, with other old-standing causes, to accumulate a mass of men and women, some who are rarely fully employed, and some who, by reason of bodily, mental, or moral weakness, are unemployable. A short breath of bad trade, such as that which is shown by the returns in the *Labour Gazette*, blowing over this almost stagnant mass so disturbs the social atmosphere as to cause anxiety. Working men watch with agony the possible break-up of their hardly kept homes, applications for Poor-Law relief are pressed in defiant or servile terms, loafers and wasters crowd to the front on the chance of getting food by force or by favour. The cry of "The Unemployed" is raised, and passions are stirred which may roughly clean the political slate.

The problem of dealing with this disease of society, whether a palliative or a permanent solution

be sought, is full of complexity. It will be enough, under the pressure of the present, to attempt to answer the question, "How may the immediate need be met?"

There are certain conclusions of experience which guide the answer:—

I. The needs of a breaking home must be met with thoroughness; there is no use in patching, and there is danger in delay; the relief must be immediate and sufficient to keep up the family strength. Inadequate help is extravagance. It spends itself and keeps poverty going.

II. The relief must be consistent with the worker's self-respect. It must, in a word, be the offer of work at a wage and of a character such as a working man may accept without any sense of obligation. A sense of obligation is a burden not easily borne either by the obliger or by the obliged.

III. There must be security that the people to whom the work is offered are *bonâ-fide* workers and not loafers. The homes must be visited, the time of residence discovered, and the actual fact of late employment be checked. The floating vagrant population, which flows in wherever relief is advertised, has in past times overwhelmed many well-meant efforts.

IV. There must be some condition interposed which, acting automatically, will stir the workers, without loss of self-respect, to seek work profitable to the community. Without some centrifugal pressure there is danger lest the workers settling down to this provided work may bring upon the community a charge which neither rates nor taxes could meet. The Mansion House Committee of 1903,

while it offered payment sufficient for the family needs, made it a condition that men should leave their homes and the attractions of the streets to work in the country, and this Committee learned how to classify different sorts of workmen. This "rustication" involves no disgrace, while it acts as a stimulus to independent effort; but it is impossible for large numbers of workers, unless arrangements are earlier made for board and lodging in the country.

The only other conditions which can be suggested as likely to prevent the evils which are so often attached to relief work are continuity, close supervision, and perhaps attendance at evening classes. Continuous work gradually trains the casual labourer, who is willing to do odd jobs but not a month's work. The continuous labour both strengthens him for other work and also presses him to trust to his own resources. The three days a week sometimes offered provides neither sufficient relief nor training; it, in fact, subsidises casual habits. Close supervision, with liability to dismissal for idleness or incompetence, prevents the workers from thinking that the work has been found for them and that they have no employer to satisfy. Attendance at evening classes would be a reminder that as State labourers they owed a duty to the State to make themselves more fit to take their part in its government. All these conditions to bring about centrifugal pressure are, however, doubtful, and none seems so effective as "rustication," which has the further advantage of accustoming men to work on land which they may make more productive.

V. There must be a hope held before the workers which, even if trade does not revive, will give a spring to their efforts. The hope might be either a settlement on the land in England or assisted emigration to the colonies. No system of relief is good which has not a way out as well as a way in. The best way out is better work at the old trade; the next best is work on the land.

Means such as these would at any rate palliate the needs of the genuinely unemployed; existing charities would look after the widows, the sick, and the weak; and the Poor Law exists to prevent the shiftless, the idle, and the single homeless man from actual starvation.

The application, however, of these means is obviously only possible if intelligent appreciation of the future has made full preparation. There ought to be a committee with ample funds at its command, so as to avoid the necessity for appeals, which rouse greed as well as unjustified hopes. There ought to be an accurate register of the resident unemployed, a well-ordered machinery for visiting the homes of applicants, a supply of honourable and useful work for willing workers, and a public opinion educated to appreciate the conditions under which work should be offered.

The winter of 1904–5 began, as other winters have begun, without any such preparation, and many of the things that ought to be done were impossible. The difficulty was met by relief-doles, as in West Ham, and by the Central Unemployed Committee in London.

The result of relief-doles is written in deep letters on the experience of East London. The Mansion

House Fund of 1887 failed to save the strength of the distressed and lowered the moral tone of the neighbourhood. How could people respect themselves when they had seen tales of their sufferings made matter for advertisement? How like an evil leaven was the example of lies which succeeded —of poverty simulated to touch a visitor's pity! How long suspicion, greed, and ill-will acted as anti-social forces! Human beings are not just animals to be fed; they have a moral sense—a nature which, however degraded, has powers of hope and trust—a memory of a high dignity. This moral sense is easily offended—in no way more easily than by "charity," by gifts which, given in pity, imply contempt, by "tickets" which imply doubt. Moral sense, which is offended, takes its vengeance against society. The recipients of charity use up their powers of hope by looking for other help, and show their dignity by animosity and ingratitude.

It is easy to understand how, under the pressure of unaccustomed sights and with no better means at hand, relief-doles have thus far been started, but it is a pity that at the cost of more trouble, more thought, more regard for experience, and more money some way was not tried which would have kept in view the needs of the moral sense as well as of the bodily health of the poor.

The Central Unemployed Committee laboured under great disadvantages. It was started too late, its council was hurriedly formed, it had to create a brand-new machinery to distinguish between the classes of the unemployed, to collect money, and to find avenues of work. If these disadvantages be

considered, it is no small achievement that within six weeks from its start there were committees in each borough who were able to receive applications and visit applicants and put within their reach the sort of help or work they seem to need; that, through the committees or directly through its own organisation, over 2,000 were put to work and openings secured which may give occupations to some thousands more.

A moment's consideration will show the effort of thought and organisation which made such success possible. Difficulties of classification, of finance, and of locomotion, the greater difficulties of dealing with personalities, the workers, the superintendents, the "philanthropists in a hurry," all had to be encountered. Critics may well have patience, and rivals in benevolence may well endure some restraint to secure conformity through London. There must, of course, be many things which might be better done, and which will be better done under the teaching of experience, but the Committee may claim to be the first relief committee which, acting for the whole of London, has aimed to give relief adequate to the needs of a worker who desires to keep his home together and to leave him untroubled by the sense of obligation or loss of self-respect. Its action was, indeed, only a palliative; what is wanted for a permanent solution of the problem of the disease called "Unemployment" is a subject for much thought, but it ought not to be beyond the reach of human care and wisdom.

The Unemployed difficulty occurring winter after winter cannot always be met by palliatives. The worst of those palliatives—doles of relief—have

proved to be poison in disguise; and the best—provision of work—is apt to decrease the volume of regular employment. The Unemployed difficulty is, as Sir Oliver Lodge says, "a root and not a fruit"; it must be ended rather than mended; it must be dealt with in its beginnings.

The "Unemployed" are now realised not simply as the people thrown out of work by a passing spell of bad trade. They are known to include the partially employed casual labourer, whose earnings are barely sufficient to pay for the insufficient accommodation of one room for his whole family; the unemployable, who, for want of brain or muscle or will, are not worth a living wage; and the loafer who in some form takes vengeance on society because it will not keep him in idleness. These very different classes are all confused together in the term "the Unemployed," and the whole body is regarded from the point of view most familiar to the spectator. The working men, for example, see nothing but "the out-of-works," and talk as if provision of work would meet the need; while many social reformers, seeing only the shiftless and the idle, are inclined to claim that some form of discipline, or perhaps some form of medical treatment, would make everything straight.

But when the make-up of the body is realised, it is obvious that no remedy is possible till some sifting process has been accomplished. The sifting is most satisfactory if it be automatic. Inquiry into the complexities of character can never be complete, and no human being readily accepts his neighbour's judgment about his rights and duties. The command to "judge not" while wheat and tares grow

together is seen, as the world grows older, to have a wider and a deeper application.

There is no need to "judge" so as to sift from the Unemployed the members of trade unions in receipt of unemployed pay. They form a separate class and may be dealt with by separate means—such means as, for instance, that adopted in Belgium, where the payment from the unions is supplemented by an equal payment from the State, paid after a certain period of unemployment, and under conditions, variously imposed, so as to prevent either waste of the common fund or degeneration in the workman's family. One such condition in England might be attendance at continuation classes.

The justification for such payments by the State is twofold. In the first place, inquiry shows that the out-of-work family takes about a year to sink into a state of destitution. The downward curve of employment is followed, after the lapse of a year, by the upward curve of pauperism. The State might, therefore, justly prevent, by some earlier payment, a fall which will involve it more or less in the support of a family whom the fall will in all probability permanently cripple. In the next place, if the State profits by a system of competitive trade in which, for no fault of the workers, spells of bad trade must occur, it seems only just that the State should carry the workers over these bad spells by some contribution to the funds they have themselves laid by—by paying, in fact, "a retaining fee," so that in the rise and fall of demand labour may always be at call.

Another class easily sifted from among the

Unemployed is the loafer. He may be suspected on account of his looks and his talk, but his "judgment" can be left to himself. He becomes a beggar, and so falls under the Vagrancy Laws, or he frequents casual wards and so is recognised as a habitual pauper. The sifting is automatic, and if the law could be extended so as to detain vagrants or habitual paupers, for periods of three or four years, there might be removed from the body of the Unemployed a whole class whose presence does the most to excite both unwise anger and unwise charity. If, further, it could be made known that the period of detention would be spent, say, on a farm or in a workshop where, without degrading treatment, the man or woman would be taught something of the power of work and of the pleasure of being, the kindly public would perhaps restrain itself from supplying the means which encourage loafing.

No law, aiming to provide the restorative discipline of training, can be effective so long as casual jobs, night shelters, and free breakfasts make it possible for people to have the opportunity to enjoy the licence and the idleness of a loafing life. The excuse for such forms of giving is that the law does not now offer restorative discipline, but harsh, unprofitable punishment, and humanity accepts the excuse. Let the law be altered, and the excuse fails. If this change in the law is ever effected, it may be expected that the most disturbing element in the problem will be gradually withdrawn, and human nature having unknown possibilities, it may be that some of the loafers will rise to become useful members of society as sailors, as emigrants, or as

gardeners, in which callings there is room for the love of change or adventure which is sometimes at the root of the vagrant habit.

The Unemployed—after the trade unionists and the loafers have thus been sifted out—may now be considered to consist of the non-unionist, the partly employed, and the unemployable.

For the first two no better plan seems to have been suggested than that of farm colonies, on which men should be sent to work and live, while their families receive sufficient for the upkeep of their homes. The advantages are many. Work in the country is healthy, and likely to be useful both in its immediate results and in fitting the worker for emigration or farming. Security is given that every one—worker and family—will have proper food; and it has been found that a period of regular good feeding is powerful on character as well as on physical strength. Further, work which is partly unremunerative, when it is given away from home and the many attractions of town life, is not so likely to tempt the breadwinners to settle down without further effort on their own behalf, as is work which is provided in their own neighbourhood; it is more likely, that is to say, to keep alive the outlook and effort in the individual which are so necessary to the strength of the community. Unless the worker is spurred to pull a little more than his own weight he will very often pull less, and there will be nothing to move the weight of the boat or carry the necessary passengers—the old, the sick, and the young. A last advantage of the plan is that as the men become trained as field labourers work might be undertaken which, if not immediately,

might be ultimately remunerative in increasing the productive powers of the country. Land might be reclaimed to make up for the 2,000 acres annually lost by erosion. The wastes might be planted with trees, and homesteads might be built on arable land turned into gardens, which many townsfolk would gladly occupy. This work, however, should not be done as relief work but in the best way by the men best fitted.

For the unemployable there seem to be no remedy but an extension of the system in vogue in workhouses or inebriate homes, which would allow the aged, the ineffectives, and the cripples to live either in families or in Communities where their labour would give them interest and in some way meet the expense which the community must under any conditions bear. The unemployable are now kept, and must always be kept. The change required is that their treatment should be such as would develop their best by making them more useful. It is, for instance, both cruel and wasteful to keep old people idle in a workhouse, or epileptics wearying themselves in an asylum, when there are many services which they might render and some actual work which they might do.

The elaboration of these remedies is impossible in a short paper written for the busy man in the street. It is also impossible to consider how the taxation of luxuries, which would provide means for the reclaiming of waste lands and other development of national strength, might affect the question of unemployment. It is enough to show that organisation for peace is as necessary as for war, and to suggest that a system of insurance, of labour farms

of discipline, and of assisted homes, together with a better arrangement of employment by public and private employers so that, by avoiding overtime, employment may be more regularly spread over the year would do much to remedy the disease called "The Unemployed."

But, in conclusion, it must be said that no remedy is effective which does not strengthen the will of the individual and raise his aspirations. Only the individual can do this for the individual. The old law of sacrifice stands, and the best must give himself for the worst. The individual who is himself in touch with higher things—however he calls those things—must come into touch with his neighbour who is on the lower plane, if legislative and administrative reforms are to be really useful.

These are reforms which are necessary—the Poor Law machinery is out of date, charity is unscientific, the incidence of taxation brings the burden of paying for the poor too heavily on to the shoulders of the poor—but such reforms are as the body to the spirit. They will only reach their end when the individuals of a community realise the high relationship—the religion—which binds them together as members of a family, in which it is the common concern that each one's capacity, each one's talent, each one's life should be raised to the highest conceivable level.

1905.

THE UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN'S ACT AND ITS AMENDMENT

The Unemployed Act of 1905 disappointed many hopes. No one has been satisfied. The applicants rejected far outnumbered those who received work, and of the latter only a few have been permanently added to the number of efficient labourers.

Mr. Burns, putting into words the thoughts of many minds, has condemned the central body for its mismanagement of business and the coddling system in vogue at the farm colonies. The weight of his condemnation is heavy.

But if this condemnation be accepted, it is fair to put on record that many members of the body gave devoted service under very difficult conditions, and that the Act has prevented the abuses of relief which in former days wrought wide ruin. There has been no Mansion House Fund, and there has been no wild distribution of gifts to provoke greed and ill-will. It is fair also to urge that, disregarding all warnings, the Act had no clauses to enable the Authority to detain loafers for lengthened periods of training, and it set up a central body constituted to satisfy the vanity of local politicians rather than to get through work.

The Act may have failed to realise many hopes, but the blame does not lie at the door of the reformers who pressed the Government of the day to deal with the Unemployed problem. The claims of politics—as is so often the case—proved to be stronger than the claims of principles.

The problem, however, still waits solution. There may be pauses in agitation, but there are always thousands of men "unemployed" ready at any moment to demonstrate their need, and evident to every one who will visit the homes of the poor. Trade may be good or bad, but inquiry has always shown that the large majority of the applicants to Distress Committees are living the same straitened lives as when they made their first applications. Many women and children are found to be without sufficient food, and men who are willing to work have not work to do. Ill-clad and half-fed figures still haunt the shelters in increasing numbers.

The Act may have failed, but something remains to be done. There is no returning to the old "let-alone" policy when charity threw its gifts according to its will and the Poor Law made relief deterrent by making it degrading. The human spirit has become too powerful to endure the results of such a policy, and the scientific spirit insists that wasteful poverty must be checked at the source.

Something must be done for the unemployed, and if the Act has failed it has brought a great addition of knowledge on the subject. That knowledge must be of value in considering what "the something" is to be. I propose, therefore, to gather up a few of the facts which have come under my notice.

I. As to the Applicants.

I. The majority of the applicants to the Distress Committees set up in the London boroughs—75 per cent., it is said—are casual labourers; men, that is, who are not wholly unemployed but partially employed. They have weeks of work when they earn a barely living wage; they are never continuously employed, and there is no week when a large body could not apply for relief. This condition of semi-employment is most unsatisfactory. It leaves the family without regular nourishment. It produces careless, loafing habits. It leads to gambling and drunkenness. It establishes a permanent body of "out-of-works" ready to swell a mob and make a disturbance. The casual rich or poor cannot be good citizens.

The class seems to be fed from many sources. Many men are casuals because when they left school at fourteen they took up some calling which gave neither discipline nor training. They became messenger boys, errand boys, or van boys. For a time they had good wages and enjoyed the variety of their occupation, but when they became men they were unfit for regular work and so dropped into irregular jobbing. Others are casuals because, having perhaps kept one place during many years, and having lost it through ill-health or misfortune, they have been unable to bustle and hustle after another place, and so have slowly sunk lower and lower in the scale of labour. Others are casuals because they were born of parents who were without regular work, or because they are constitutionally unable to follow one pursuit, or because they love the excitement of uncertainty.

II. The 25 per cent. who are not casuals belong for the most part to a class below that of the skilled worker—the class of ordinary labourers—as a rule steady men, who with occasional outbreaks and average ability have won fair characters from their employers. They are those who are the first to lose their places when trade is slack or when the foreman has the chance of taking on some fresh, strong young countrymen. They have few resources on which to depend, little energy to make a new start, and they soon sink in the scale. This is a class which Mr. Burns often seems to forget, and yet it is the members of this class who haunt the memories of visitors who know the unemployed. They have done their best—a poor best indeed—but they have been beaten in the struggle, and now come timidly to the table of the Distress Committee asking for work which they are ready and willing to do.

III. The last fact about the applicants is that the loafers and cadgers do not apply. They are prominent in the streets and the parks. They are met with in quiet lanes, and they seem to rise out of the earth to lift luggage from a cab. They know the art of begging, and are able to bully timid people and to interest the curious with marvellous tales. They are said to gain much money, and certainly they do not apply when it is only work which is offered.

II. As to the Work Offered.

The Committees had two types of work: (*a*) that which could be done by applicants in London, (*b*)

that which necessitated their temporary removal into the country.

(*a*) The work done in London was generally in the parks or open spaces under the usual Council foremen. The universal testimony is that the work did not secure the energy of the workers. It was ill done, and proved to be very costly. The men knew that the work was made for them. It was their own, could they not treat it as they liked? In one way it seemed unfair that work should be required when the money had been given for their use. Whatever the reasoning in their own minds, the work was not done as it is done for an employer who has the power of dismissal. The men knew that no one was concerned to dismiss them, so slack work became the order of the day, and men who have started with a will have confessed that the display of energy brought them into disrepute. The committees tried by various means to raise the standard, but once more an experiment in relief work has shown that it is not only costly but demoralising. The recipients of the work were not braced, as they might have been braced by regular work, to better their position. They made no efforts to do themselves good, and on one gang the effect of an extra and unexpected day's work was to bring them drunk to the pay-table.

(*b*) The work provided at the "Colonies" and elsewhere out of London forced on the men the initial self-sacrifice of leaving the sights and delights of the streets. They had, moreover, to do work which was waiting to be done, and which without them would not be done. The results, however, are not satisfactory. The men returned, indeed,

stronger in body and fitter for work. Some had developed new aptitudes, but as a rule they had not learnt self-reliance, and for the most part settled down to their old life in the belief that next winter they might return to the colony. The colony, in fact, had been made too comfortable with its short working hours, its Saturday half-holidays, its treats, its entertainments, and its billiard-tables. There may be wisdom in developing the man's capacities for new interest, but among the unemployed there is a special need to develop energy. Relief cannot, therefore, be made too comfortable; it must not, indeed, involve any self-degradation, but it must involve some self-sacrifice. The old Poor Law reformers were right in principle when they laid it down that work provided by the community must be less eligible than that provided in the market. The way in which that principle has been applied under the Poor Law may not be justified, but because it has been forgotten in the colonies the unemployed have been too much inclined to rest on their comforts.

III. Employment Exchanges.

It has been said with some show of truth that the Unemployed Act has justified itself by the creation of the twenty-five Employment Exchanges in London. It is only by such Exchanges that casual labour will be organised. Employers in certain trades cannot keep on permanent hands, but the Exchanges by pooling and then distributing their demands may make labour more continuous. Mr. Beveridge, the chairman of the committee, has published interesting papers on their work which

tell of their difficulties, their incompleteness, and their hopes. From one of these papers it seems that during the first five months of 1907 the number of registrations has been 40,318. The number of situations filled during the same time has been 7,506 (5,775 males and 1,731 females)—giving an average of 1,500 a month. This, as a beginning, is no small achievement and points the way to further success.

These facts which stand out of one year's experience suggest certain lines which another Unemployed Bill might follow.

The authority which administers the Act, whether in London or in the provinces, must proceed from one source and be responsible to that source. It must—that is to say, in London—either be directly elected or be appointed by the London Council. There are manifest objections to *ad hoc* elections in which petty interests and narrow views get undue importance, so it would seem as if the Council should be the body to create the Authority. It might appoint members of the borough councils and other persons with local or special knowledge; but to the Council it would be responsible and to the Council it should report. The present London Authority—the Central Unemployed Body—is as badly constituted as it is possible to conceive. Bodies composed of delegates are notoriously weak, and this particular body is in the extraordinary position of having as delegates members of other bodies which are at once independent and subordinate. The body has had to undertake a wide variety of work, including sea-walling, agriculture, and business arrangements for which it

had no experience. There has been no authority over it, and it has had no authority over the local committees. The independence of these local committees has been an endless source of unnecessary correspondence, friction, and negotiation. It is no wonder that this central body has sometimes wasted force on the exhibition of vanity either of persons or of opinions, and that the local bodies have followed diverse courses according to their will. The one thing necessary in a new Act is the establishment of a strong Authority which exists to perform certain functions to the satisfaction of the chief municipal body, and not just to represent the fortuitous opinions of irresponsible borough councils or charitable societies.

The Authority should be given power to detain habitual beggars and vagrants for long periods of training. It may be that this class is not found among the applicants for relief, but their existence always confuses the problem. The richer classes see them in their squalor and wretchedness; they think they represent the unemployed, and then, according to their disposition, they give their money wildly to shelters and free meals, or shut up all their compassion against such dissolute and unworthy persons. The working classes see them, and, ignorantly imagining them to be the direct outcome of employers' selfishness, they call out for vindictive remedies. Until they are withdrawn the temper for dealing with the unemployed will be absent. Foolish giving will go on tempting the poor to make a show of poverty, and ignorant anger will prevent benevolent wisdom. Their withdrawal need not be harsh or involve prison

treatment. The community would, in fact, say to its prodigals, "We cannot afford to let you waste yourselves and our substance; you must be restrained, but you shall not be degraded or shut out from hope. You shall be confined to this colony or this workshop for two or three years. You shall have work worthy a man's doing; you shall have necessary recreation and interests; you shall be able to earn and save money; you shall have the chance which you missed of fitting yourself for citizenship. You shall have everything except liberty, and that you may win. If, however, you misuse this chance, then you must be relegated to prison and prison fare." The next Act must, I submit, establish "Schools of Restraint."

The work provided for applicants by the Authority, whether it be to give them training in some new occupation or to afford them means of getting through a bad time, should in some distinct way be differentiated from work to be obtained in the open market. The original suggestion that men should be required to live away from their homes, and work in country colonies, had manifest advantages. It involved no degradation; it secured that every worker could have food, lodging, and good air, and it demanded a certain amount of sacrifice. But in practice, as we have seen, life in a colony has for some men been too attractive; it has seemed better than the life of home and better than the life of countrymen in the neighbourhood. It has proved to be relief without training, and it has tended to make colonists regard themselves as favoured children of society. For other men the country life and the work it offers has seemed

altogether unsuitable. The new Bill might require that employment, whether given on a country farm or in town, should be primarily for "training." The community should, that is, provide not a "workshop" but a "school." If the men are put on a farm it should be with the view of fitting them for land work at home or abroad, and the day's labour should be followed by evening learning. If the men are employed in workshops or in work near their homes, it should be in a sort of day industrial school, where they would have good food together and be required to attend classes as well as to work. They might be allowed to remain in these "schools" during good behaviour or until an opening for outside work had been offered. The long hours and the enforced regularity would prevent the men from settling down without making an effort to better themselves; the teaching would often revive old capacities and create new interests; and the knowledge that they could not be turned off till a place was found would prevent the hopelessness which is the paralysis of labour. In case of misbehaviour the penalty would be dismissal, or even removal for two or three years' enforced training in the School of Restraint. There must be no blurring of the line between independence and assistance. The work a man does for relief must be unlike that which he does for a living. This in practice may be secured by giving relief to the able-bodied subject to some training on educational conditions.

The duty of organising Employment Exchanges is not one to be associated with the duty of dealing with the unemployed. It should have no place in the next Bill, but by another Bill it

should be made part of the regular duty of the Labour Department of the Board of Trade. By this means these exchanges could be established according to one system throughout the country. Employers and employed could be brought together in their management, and truth about the condition of the labour market would make many free.

But, whatever be the terms of the next Bill, it must be remembered that the best Bill can be no more than a palliative. It deals with a state of things which ought not to exist, and its triumph will be if, without making that state worse, it is able to prevent some suffering. The remedy for unemployment lies much deeper. Men are unemployed because, born of feeble parents and brought up in close streets, they are unfit for work; because, ill-taught and untrained, they as boys took up work which gave neither training nor future; because industry is so ill-organised, and because labour has so few attractions in the country. Moral thoughtfulness widely extended among individuals alone can go to the root of the matter. When rich and poor think morally many causes of poverty will be removed which are now disregarded. The ways of education, the recreations of the people, and the customs of trade will all be considered. It has not yet entered into the mind of a man to conceive his duty to his neighbour; but many things have been done by Parliament, and more things might be done, in this generation to get at the roots of unemployment.

More security, for example, might be given by law that houses should be living houses—not merely sanitary, but such as promote joy in life. The

haphazard strife of greed to crowd house on house would therefore be prevented. Some form of insurance against unemployment might be provided by a community which requires that labour shall be "on call" to meet its necessities. The hope of the secure tenure of land might be opened to countrymen as an inducement to the more adventurous spirits to cultivate the soil and make other valleys blossom, as the Vale of Evesham blossoms, to their own profit. The formation of new roads, the afforesting of the denuded hills, might be undertaken by a Government Department, not to give work to the unemployed, but to employ those fitted for the labour, many of whom, for want of such work, now crowd into London and become the favourites of foremen.

But chief among the more radical remedies for unemployment I am disposed to put a better system of elementary education, which will include compulsory evening schools. It is in the years which lie between school and work that the most mischief occurs. The restraint on which they rested being removed, the children have no support either in tradition or in character. They drop learning as a childish thing; they go after pleasure as a right. They have, however, small capacity for pleasure of the mind, and they take to the excitements of sights and sounds and tastes. The great demand for boy-labour secures for them a good wage but gives them no means of preparing to gain a livelihood or to enjoy life. They are discharged when they reach man's estate with no trade in their hands or knowledge in their heads. Many of the best and most far-sighted employers have recognised this

evil, and have compelled their young people up to the age of sixteen to attend evening classes. Messrs. Cadbury, realising that people must live as well as earn a living, require that one class shall be in a "hobby." Every clergyman and missionary will tell what is done for boys and girls in clubs, where the teachers get real control, and every newspaper has reports of what is done by hooligans and others who follow their own will. A real check on unemployment would therefore be an Act of Parliament which will compel employers to get for every young person in their employ a weekly certificate of attendance at three evening classes in each week. The duty of such attendance will regularise their lives; they will keep in touch with what they have learnt in school; and they will develop tastes which will be a source of recreation. It may be that a better system of elementary education, organised to suit a society formed on an industrial basis, would so interest the children and satisfy the parents that there would be little difficulty in holding the children up to the age of sixteen. At present the connexion between school-learning and the needs of life is not easily recognised, as it would be if, without too much specialisation, learning bore on some calling in industry or commerce. But until such better system can be elaborated, compulsory continuation schools would, I believe, dry up one source which feeds the class of the unemployed.

1907.

WORK AND THE UNEMPLOYED

"GIVE as much employment as possible, but do not employ 'the unemployed,'" is a formula forged out of past experience.

When trade is bad, and skilled men are out of work, and when there is no demand for their labour, Society for its own sake must preserve them not only from starvation but from loss of respect. The best way, obviously, is to find them employment under the usual conditions as to wages and efficient performance. Hence comes the suggestion, addressed both to individuals and to public authorities, "Give as much employment as possible through the usual channels of foremen or tradesmen or contractors, and allow no overtime."

There is some work which might be pushed forward and done in the present year instead of in future years, when it may be hoped that trade will have revived or that a more scientific method of dealing with the problems of industry and poverty may have been discovered.

There is much work of utility which, if not in immediate demand, would yet by its performance increase the health and happiness of mankind. There are dirty and untidy places which might be put in order; there are gloomy buildings which might be coloured, marshes which could be turned

into playing-fields, bare places which could be covered with trees, houses which could be improved and painted, old machinery which could be scrapped to make room for new, and stone paving which could be changed for wood.

Every individual, indeed, by some thought and consideration, could divert expenditure so as to give more employment, substituting, for instance, the fresh painting of a house or the clearing up of some untidiness for some form of self-indulgence.

Public authorities and individuals, by giving out work of this sort through the usual avenues by which they at ordinary times give out work—putting it out by contract after receiving estimates, or employing direct labour through their foremen, whichever be their usual custom—could employ most of those workers who have been displaced by bad times. The expenditure would not, indeed, be economical; it would represent a draft on the future, and, if long continued, would result in bankruptcy. The assumption, however, is that the need is transient, and as in some way the need has to be met, money is better expended in giving honourable employment than in relief.

Hence follows the second clause in the formula: "Do not employ the 'unemployed'"—do not, that is to say, take on workers because they are out of work, without regard to their fitness. If individuals or public authorities do so they are almost compelled either to offer a lower wage or to be content with a lower level of performance. They cannot, as under ordinary conditions, select the men best fitted for the work to be done, and they cannot discharge a man for inefficiency whom

they have taken on for the sake of giving him employment. The majority of the registered "unemployed" are, we know, casual labourers. They are always ready to apply, and are not as a rule fit for any specialised work. Housekeepers who have given them jobs offer themselves as witnesses testifying to what they have endured from the badness of the work done. "He was half a day cleaning a few windows, and put his arm through two panes of glass," is a specimen of such testimony. The public authorities who have taken on "the unemployed" have found the cost of the work increased sometimes by 40 per cent., and foremen report as to the mischief they have done.

The employment of "the unemployed," regardless of their fitness, to do work which qualified men are waiting to do, is very unfair to working people—unfair if a lower wage is given, and unfair also if unfitness secures a sort of immunity from discharge. The offer of employment to the "unemployed" draws on the almost inexhaustible supplies of casual labour; it gives, as Mr. Harold Cox says, a preference to the unfit; it keeps out the man who can dig, or paint, or build, or sow for the sake of the man who cannot; it substitutes for the usual method of selection a method which gives an equal, if not a better, chance to the most improvident, and it lowers the standard of work.

The standard of work is, it must be remembered, the workman's chief interest. If that standard falls he himself gradually becomes less efficient, his work less worth the doing, and he himself less worth his wages. The employment of men and women just because they are out of work is

sure to lower this standard. The labourer who does digging alongside of the painter gradually accommodates his effort and his output to that of the painter, while the painter does not become a first-class labourer. Their capacity for earning has suffered, and they probably go to swell the ranks of "the unemployed" of the future.

Incapacity—not only want of skill, but want of sustained energy and want of interest in accomplishment—is, it must also be remembered, a fruitful source of unemployment. A great body of men, because they have not been trained nor disciplined, are refused by employers. A contractor reported the other day that in order to get 200 steady and qualified men for his job he had been compelled to pass 1,600 men through his works. This incapacity may not be altogether the men's fault; they have not had the opportunity to get health or knowledge; they are victims of an industrial system whose development has been neglected; but whether it be wholly or partly their fault, they will not be helped by doles of money or of work. The way up, whatever be the cause of the descent, must always be hard. The child who suffers because of his parents' bad choice of food or by his own can only be cured by medicine. The incapable workman cannot be helped by the blind kindness which lets him go on to become more incapable; he cannot rise, unless by the hard way of discipline and the steep hill of difficulty.

A proposal that the public authorities are to set work on foot through the usual channels of employment is thus wholly good; but any further proposal that local authorities shall receive from the State a

subsidy to meet the loss which would follow when "the unemployed" are put on such work is open to the objection that it fosters incapacity. The local authorities will actually be encouraged to employ the incapable so as to get a larger subsidy, and not even Mr. Burns's eyes can see and prevent every abuse. The work which might have been done well by able workers at hand to do it will be less well done by unable workers—the wages which might have been earned by trained men will go to the untrained without giving them the discipline which comes when work is done under the fear of discharge; the fatal heresy will be encouraged that there is a benefit when by any means, as by ca'-canny methods, work may be spread over more workers; and the dignity of work will be degraded as it is given the likeness to a dole.

Work has again and again suffered in reputation by being associated with relief. The Poor Law, with its tasks of labour, its stone-breaking and oakum-picking, has done much to make work seem distasteful and something to be escaped. The Unemployed Workmen Act hampered the development of labour exchanges by making them part of the machinery of distress committees, and any proposal to use work as a means of relief follows bad precedents.

The best policy in times of exceptional bad trade is, I submit, to create conditions as like as possible to those which exist in good times. This might be done by increasing employment through the usual channels. "The unemployed" who do not under these conditions find work because it would pay no foreman nor tradesman to hire their labour must

be provided for by other means—not by charity—not wholly by the workhouse but by training.

The problem may not be easy, but steps to its solution have been taken. There are some of these unemployed who might be sent to labour colonies, where they will get health and strength while they learn to dig and plant. There are some who might be put on land near their homes under a superintendent, where they would be regarded as learners, and be paid not as workmen but to receive an allowance during the period of pupilage. There are others who in workshops might be taught a trade, or in schools get the training of discipline and regularity. For those who refuse to take advantage of such a provision of training there remains at present only the Poor Law, with its prison-like refuge. We regret that this last resort is so hopeless, but till our legislators give authority for the enforced detention of the men who refuse opportunities to fit themselves for earning, there is no other resource. When that authority is given, the period of enforced detention may also be used to open to the idle the interest which may be found in useful labour.

The Government will, if past experience be a guide, be well advised to amend its offer to local authorities, and make grants, not to meet the extra cost of work due to the employment of "the unemployed," but simply as a means of enabling them to do extra work and employ more hands in the regular way. The Distress Committees might at the same time be encouraged to provide training for all applicants for relief, and give them during this period of training sufficient support for themselves and their families. 1908.

PUBLIC FEEDING OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

CHILDREN must be fed, if they are to become vigorous men and women. Family life must be strengthened, if parents are to retain their self-respect, and children develop the sense of obligation which will make them good citizens.

The children whom the nation educates are often insufficiently fed. Statistics and doctors' reports are not necessary to prove the fact. Visitors to the schools in poor neighbourhoods may convince themselves that, whether it be from poverty, ignorance, or carelessness, many of the children are ill-nourished, unfit to benefit by the teaching they receive, unlikely to become vigorous helpers of their country. The obvious remedy is free meals. But family life owes much of its strength to the family meal, whose preparation and expectation keep together the hearts of mother and children. The dinner or the supper in the home feeds the memories as well as the bodies of the children. It stores in their minds the thought of their parents' care, it brings out their sympathy with one another's needs, it teaches manners, provokes common conversation, impresses the use of order. The family meal is thus the sacrament of family life, one of the means by which the home is kept together;

and it is reverence for the home which makes the days of a people to be long in the land.

The provision of free meals, gradually extending through the population, would thus remove one of the bonds of family life. Good mothers would naturally think—do as a fact think—that an ample dinner in the school is better than anything they can provide. They save themselves the worry of preparation, they feel free to go out to work; and so more and more of those little cares and graces which make up the home are lost. Fathers are less drawn homewards, and less impelled to press for higher wages; and so money which would make a better home is missed. Here, then, is the problem. The children must be fed; yet common feeding tends to relax the family life, which is as much the strength of a nation as the bones and muscles of its people.

The problem is the more dificult, because the nation, in its satisfaction at its increasing wealth, has allowed many of the sources of family life to dry up. The little England which made the greater England was more truly an England of homes than the England of to-day, with its aggregations of featureless streets and model dwellings. Our fathers, who remembered, it may be, a cottage and its garden, who grew up sharing their parents' interest in their work or their neighbours, could say and feel "there is no place like home," and loved their country:

> "Accounting her all living lands above,
> In justice, and in mercy, and in love."

The change is shown by the remarks of the

children who now go out of London to spend their holidays in the country; they frequently tell their wonder at the fulness of the cottagers' life, the order of their meals, the housewife's care, the common interests in the family talk. The aliens, too, who settle in East London are remarkable for their different habits as to the home. The Jewish mother rarely goes out to work; and her one morning care is her children's meal. The English mother often hurries her child off to school with a bit of dry bread and a penny to buy anything; the Jewish mother, whose circumstances are as poor, or poorer, will have ready at the dinner hour a dish of hot, fat, and nourishing food. The result is that, among the Jews, there are no underfed children, and, among many foreigners settled in London, family life holds together young and old, though their homes are as poor as those of their English neighbours.

In the great towns the children in the streets are indeed lights in darkness. There are no children like the English, none so seriously happy and so free, none so lovable and so boldly original. But, as they grow up, they miss the inspiration and restraint of family life. They become wage-earners, and bargain with their mother for board; they take their pleasures without their parents; they keep themselves to themselves; they do not recognise the obligation of being "good company"; they are not intelligent, and are inclined to recognise no duty which cannot be enforced. There are faults in the English people to-day which may be traced largely to that decay of family life which has followed their aggregation in hordes, as if

they had no other use than to be "instruments of production."

In our great towns, indeed, family life counts for so little, that many reformers become impatient if anything is said about its preservation. "The children are hungry, feed them; your talk about the home is sentiment." "If meals are provided, the mothers will have more time for home work" —as if the children's care were not the home work. Well, they may be so far right, that it is necessary to feed the children; but they are not right in thinking that the family is irreparably lost as a factor in progress, or that well-fed individuals, untrained and undeveloped by home responsibilities, would form either a happy or a useful community.

The problem is thus complicated, both by the extent to which neglect has allowed the children's need to grow, and also by the indifference which has watched the relaxation of family life. The children's hunger is now greater than can be satisfied without the establishment of some machinery; family life is so broken up that it hardly seems worth preservation.

The first step in the solution of a problem is a conception of the whole object desired. "Where there is no vision the people perish." What do we want? A city of individuals, or a city of homes —a city where poor parents will surrender the care of the children, or a city where no one shall be too poor to have his own home, with sufficient room for family pleasure, and sufficient food for family strength—a city where the children will be fed at a barrack mess, or one where they will sit round a table wisely and amply spread by a

mother's skilled and thoughtful care out of their father's just wages? The latter is surely the city of our vision. For its completion the State has much to do—common pleasures and common resources to supply—undue monopolies and unjust aggressions to reform; but the home varieties and home charms must be preserved which give interest to common intercourse, and educate the heart to become the source of thought. The French reformer recognised the value of such education. When he had drawn up an excellent scheme for the upbringing of all the children of the nation in national nurseries and homes, he made it part of the constitution of his scheme that each committee in charge of one of those institutions should include at least five experienced fathers of families. Many reformers, like the Frenchman, forget that the success of their schemes depends on home or spiritual influences, which their schemes destroy.

The influences of family life are still strong, though they have been so broken up and disregarded. The institution may be said to be in a transition state. The old patriarchal authority, which required unquestioning obedience, is going, as surely as the old parental authority which had the power of life and death is gone. In the family of the future parents will be less tyrannical and more courteous; and children will be less servile and more appreciatively respectful. It will allow for more freedom, for more independence, and for stronger individualities; but it will be as great a school of feeling as in the past. A transition state is one which needs delicate handling. Family life among the masses of the people is unstable; and a rash inter-

ference with duties long recognised as obligatory would greatly prejudice its advance. Family life, it may be said, is not "going out," any more than "nationalities" are going out; both are "going on" to a higher level. Because family life is not dead, because its influence is necessary in the city of our vision, it is very important to discover how the children may be fed, and family life be strengthened for its development in the future.

The ideal way would be, that personal care should meet individual need. It is conceivable that, while people with the power to give help so far outnumber the people who need help, a friend might be found to search with patience for the cause of each case of ill-nourishment. The causes are many. It is sometimes ignorance, which gives ample food but not of the sort which has any value. Love without knowledge feeds babies on cake and children on tinned meat. It is sometimes disease, which, for want of treatment, consumes the child's life. It is sometimes carelessness, which lets dirt accumulate and the children shift for themselves. It is sometimes poverty. The cause might in each case be discovered and then dealt with. It is conceivable, in a country in which so many people call themselves Christians, that enough might be found who, following their Master, would bear their neighbours' sins as well as their poverty. A friendly and self-giving interest would often take away the ignorance or the carelessness; and a generous and wise gift would often prevent poverty.

But, even if it may be hoped that Christian charity may some day put on modern garments, and in the old spirit serve present needs, still the

cry presses. "The children starve; they cannot wait till love revives; they must be fed." Then the practical way is at once to establish some machinery by which dinners may be provided.

Sir Charles Elliott, a notable administrator and a devoted servant of London children, sets out a complete scheme in the May number of the *Empire Review* of 1905. His article is valuable as a summary of past history and experience. His proposal is, that a Relief Committee in each necessitous school shall control officials—inspectors and others—appointed by the Education Authority, and a fund supplied by voluntary subscriptions, that members of the Relief Committee shall make inquiries into home conditions, that every underfed child shall be provided with food, and that the cost shall be recoverable from parents able to pay. Sir John Gorst, who is crowning his career as the children's representative in Parliament by his passionate protest against the neglect which has left so many underfed in the schools, differs only from Sir Charles Elliott as to the remedy, in that he would employ an official committee using public money.

Great is the controversy between advocates of food supplied by voluntary subscriptions and that supplied by rates or taxes. There is much to be said on each side, much which, from an administrative point of view, is important; but, after all, the effect on the recipients is in either case the same. It does not in the least matter, as far as family life is concerned, out of what pocket the money comes. The eternal distinction of Charity is that it is personal, the gift of man to man, warmed by

feeling and guided by knowledge, where the gift and the giver go together. The State can by no lavishness take the place of such charity; and, even when Charity creates a fund, which it administers through officers and officials, the personality is lost, and the recipients feel nothing of the power of personal care and thought.

The objections to such a "practical way" of solving the problem are the same, whether it be undertaken by committees of visitors or by some official body. In the first place, trust in the power of selecting is doomed to disappointment. There is no inspector, there is no human knowledge, which can decide what parent should, and what parent should not, be bound to feed his own children. There is no human being who will not feel humiliated at being called on to justify his poverty to a stranger, and take his place among the dependants. There are no human beings, either, who will not feel themselves unfairly treated when, after the exertion of self-denial to feed their children, they hear that better-off and more careless or more selfish parents have received help.

In the first place, therefore, these attempts to decide by investigation, these summonses to parents to disclose the secrets of home which ought to be sacred, these provocations to inter-family jealousies, prejudice the strength of family life; and, in the second place, the public provision of the common meal gradually does away with the meal, which is often the strength of the home, as a meal has in other times been found to be the strength of a tribe, a guild, or a Church.

The question therefore still recurs: "Can the

children who are now underfed be provided with food, without blighting the influences which surround family life? Is it possible to give food without wounding any one's self-respect, and leave to the parents the ennobling duty of providing and preparing the family meal?"

The essential qualification seems to me to be universality of relief. There must be no attempt at distinguishing between characters, no assumption of power to judge between deserving and undeserving, no marking off a class as a "dependent" or a "pauper" class, nothing which may increase in the nation habits of suspicion or of cringing.

Two suggestions have been made.

1. A breakfast of porridge, with milk and treacle, might be prepared in certain central schools at 8 o'clock, open to all school children, so that none might feel humiliated by coming or aggrieved by being refused. The mischief of selection would be avoided. The food would be such as amply to sustain the children's strength; and its provision would not interfere with the preparation of other meals—dinner or supper—which, in the parents' eyes, are more important. The early hour would call out effort, and perhaps induce earlier hours of going to bed. The meal should, of course, be daintily served, so as to encourage a care for order in eating; and it should be presided over by teachers, so that the children might have the sense of being guests to be entertained, and not just animals to be fed. The plan has been tried; and the responsible manager reports the satisfaction of children, teachers, and parents. But, as he

truly says, it is not certain that the breakfasts would be so well received if "given by order and not as a personal matter." This particular manager's intimacy with all concerned brought into the provision that personal element which made it, in the peculiar sense, "charity."

2. Another more simple suggestion is, that the managers in every school should, without any distinction, provide the children with milk, and that the teachers should see to its consumption. The milk would be food exactly fitted to the children's needs; the habit of its use would prevent habits of unwise eating and drinking; and—what is most important—the parents would in nowise feel themselves relieved from the duty of providing the regular meals. The present consumption of milk, it should be remembered, is far below what it ought to be, if the bodies of the people are to be properly nourished. The adoption of this suggestion would not, it may be added, interfere with the personal charity whose growing activity is a happy sign of the times. As society becomes more and more a city of friends, citizens able to guide, to teach, or to help, will be found to touch the causes be they ignorance or carelessness or selfishness, of which the underfed child is only a symptom. Such charity has already accomplished much in this generation.

It may be claimed, then, that the porridge breakfast or free milk meets the immediate needs of the ill-nourished children. And it leaves unsilenced in the ears of parents those calls which, irritating to their love of ease, are yet divinely ordered for their good. Parents would still feel the duty of

gathering their children together to share their chief meals; society would still feel the duty of going deeper into the causes of poverty. It would be a bad day for parents if, because the children were provided for, they themselves were free of responsibility; it would be a worse day for society if, because it had taxed itself to give food to the children, it felt satisfied to give up caring that rents are too high, wages too low, and education insufficient.

It may not always be a disgrace to poor parents that their children go to school unfed, though, in view of what the aliens do for their children, a little healthy reprobation would not be out of place. But it is a disgrace to rich society that the people perish for want of air, for want of water, for want of knowledge, for want of the care neighbours might give to neighbours, landlords to tenants, or employers to employed. The provision of porridge or milk in the schools would secure the children nourishment, and still leave parents and society face to face with undone duties.

1905.

PAUPERISM AND INSTITUTIONS

The increase of pauperism during seasons of prosperity ought to draw the attention of Londoners to the policy of Poor Law administration. The number of persons in receipt of relief in 1902 was 128,490, which is 4,979 in excess of those in receipt at the same time 1901. The cost of the relief in 1901 was £4,044,191, an increase of £273,265 on the cost in 1900.

These figures are startling enough to set Londoners thinking of many things of which they shrink from thinking. The social problem has not been solved by prosperity, neither has the bitter cry of the poor ceased because it is not heard amid the sounds of war. Many agencies will have to improve their methods before the problem is solved, and the Poor Law is only one of many agencies. The policy, however, of its administration is important; and the interesting Christmas article in the *Times* on "The Legal Poor of London" always shows how that policy is marked by a development of building operations. During 1901 expenditure for this object was authorised amounting to £799,192. This expenditure, moreover, is exclusive of a sum probably equally as large incurred by the Metropolitan Asylums Board in providing hospitals, and

represents only what the guardians themselves are spending on institutions. Three-quarters of a million of money in one year! Here is evidence of the growth of a trust in institutions. We—closely connected with Poor Law administration during thirty years—have learnt more and more to distrust institutions.

Institutions are expensive. Guardians, for the honour of their boards or in the exuberance of their goodwill, add building to building. Experts among the officials or faddists on the board are led to experiment with new inventions and to carry out the last theory. Buildings completed twenty or thirty years ago are thus always in course of reconstruction, and some, such as a few of the great barrack schools, are now condemned as useless for their purpose. A return as to the cost of Poor Law buildings during the last twenty years would be instructive reading.

Institutions are prejudicial to strength of character. Progress, every one knows, depends on individual effort, and individual effort, every one knows, is easily relaxed. Institutions, which with some grand opening ceremony flaunt their attractions and impose their greatness over a neighbourhood, advertising their provision of relief, make it harder for the poorer classes who see and hear such things to sustain individual effort. The son lets his old mother go to the workhouse which is so admirably planned, where she will have the comforts of which he has read the catalogue. The neighbour lets the children of his friend go to the school, where the rooms are palatial; where a doctor attends daily; where there is a servant for every seven children;

and where pigs grow fat on the children's leavings. Institutions preach sermons in stones against the virtue of independence, and yet it is this virtue which makes the money which pays for their support.

Institutions do not always achieve their purpose. If they did provide comfort for the old and education for the children—the best possible—we, conscious of the sorrow of the poor and of the cost of ignorance, might be inclined to say, "Go on building, so as to decrease sorrow and increase knowledge; other means must be found for counteracting the effect of institutions on energy and independence" —whether it would be possible to do so is another question. Institutions, however, do not save either old or young.

The old may be warmed and fed, they may have easy-chairs and means of recreation, but they have not liberty. They are not free to feel the stimulus which comes from change, from the variety of sight and talk, from the gossip of friends with living interests, and from the play of children. They have not the impulse from the young which is the due of the old, and they feel as if they were dead in life, useless for work, and incapable of joy.

Children, too, in "blocks" or in "village communities" may have all the food medical knowledge can prescribe, they may be warmed and clothed and taught, they may live in rooms furnished with electric lights, and play regularly at football and cricket, and they may be kept clean and free from contamination. They are not, however, as happy as they would be if they could invent their games, choose their own companions, tease and dodge the

not unkindly policeman, cry over difficulties, and laugh over the surprises of change and chance. Neither do they learn to be so intelligent and resourceful as if they heard their elders discuss ways and means, saw the shifts born of necessity, and were left, without handy appliances, to become handy and without servants to find out how to serve. Probably, too, they are not so safe from neglect and ill-treatment as if they lived under the eyes of neighbours, whose watchfulness is more constant than that of guardians and less inclined to be blind to abuses than that of officials bound to stand by one another. Certainly they cannot learn to love—however kind may be the guardians and officers—as those children learn to love to whom some individual and not "a staff" or "a body" stands *in loco parentis*.

Institutions thus expensive and unsatisfactory may be to some extent necessary. They are, of course, necessary for dealing with sickness and certain classes of people, but for the reasons stated they should be limited. The question is, how? We might reply that more humane conduct on the part of landlords and employers, wiser administration of charity, a better ordered city, greater temperance among the poor, a more enlightening system of education, would decrease the need of institutions.

But the question is, things being as they are, how can this growth of institutions be checked? To that question our answer is, "By the greater use of the unused resources of country districts." Experience is daily showing that the towns cannot save themselves. The pressure on their house accommodation is to be relieved by easier means of

transit to the country. The conditions which make work so destructive of health are to be improved by the removal of factories into the country. The sick in body and mind are to be cured in country hospitals, and the children have to find their happiest holidays in country cottages.

In the same way many of the old and feeble—many of the children for whom institutions are now established—might be "boarded out." The suggestion will, we are aware, be met by a chorus of disapproval. "There are not sufficient cottages in the country." "The country people are not to be trusted."

In the first place, there are thousands of cottages in which town people or children could be received. The various country holiday funds have at least 20,000 children at one time living in cottages or farmers' homes during the summer months. These country people may not all be willing to take permanent guests, they may not be able to offer suitable accommodation, but out of so many village housewives there must surely be some thousands with hearts and homes large enough to admit a stranger. In the next place, the reports of the children who enjoy the fortnight's holiday, and of the visitors who see to their happiness, are full of tales of kindness and hospitality. There are, of course, some instances of carelessness and neglect, some tales which, like shadows, get more notice because of the sunshine; but the general experience goes to show that there is stored up in the country a real interest in town people and a willingness to share their burden. Many is the country woman who has spent her labour in cleaning and feeding a town

child. Many are the presents of flowers and fruit the children bring back from country friends.

The world is older than it was in days when abuses were common. People have learnt humanity, the country is not so full, and parish councils have been established.

Boards of guardians might, therefore, board out with good hope of success. (At present they board out under 6 per cent. of the children under their care.) The pay they could offer would make a great difference in the income of a village. Ten adults and ten children would, for instance, mean an addition of £400 a year spent in paying the rent and supporting the industries of the place. The placing of the people and the responsibility for their welfare might be left to the parish council, who would probably be dignified by the trust. There would, of course, be the further security of an inspector's visit, although no inspector is so efficient or so up-to-date as public opinion.

Beyond the actual profit to the country in the payment received from the guardians there is much economic value in the service of people now put away as useless. "An old woman," we learned the other day, "is generally worth 2s. or 3s. a week." She can mind the children, she can pick fruit, she can do sewing, she can go messages. This is even more true of old men. As to those boarded out—adults or children—it goes without saying that they would be happier and more fit for life than if they were kept idle in costly and palatial institutions.

They may not, indeed, always live under conditions to satisfy an inspector; but what family—working class or higher class—would satisfy the

requirements generally imposed by an official of the Local Government Board? There is clearly something more important than the size of a cottage bedroom or the state of a child's clothes, or even the flea-marks on its body. These things mean much or little, as they are taken in relation to other things not to be measured by rules but only by sympathy. If in the eyes of the neighbours all seems to be right—if in the opinion of a visitor or inspector the person or child is healthy and happy, the good-nature of the cottager may be trusted to do well by a lonely stranger.

Trust, and not suspicion, is the best weapon of an inspector. Self-respecting farmers and cottagers will never accept boarded-out guests if at the visit of the inspector their houses are to be ransacked and themselves humiliated by suspicious questions. Trust is not necessarily blind, and there may be occasions when the most rigorous searching may be advisable; but when the parish council is made responsible and when the visitor or inspector has those eyes of sympathy which see more deeply than those of a detective, the greater number of country people may be trusted to do their duty. Their ways will not be according to rule; they will, as all human ways, be according to character, and, unless there is evident cruelty or neglect, are more likely to be helpful if left without interference. Happily, there are more well-disposed than evil-disposed people in the world, and English people are not likely to allow that the country people of England are less humane than those of other countries, where "boarding out" so often takes the place of institutions. 1902.

THE VERDICT ON THE BARRACK SCHOOLS

Much public attention has recently been drawn to Poor Law children, and it is well that it should be so.

In 1894 a certain infants' attendant at the Hackney Schools was proved to have systematically ill-used the babes under her care, beating the naked bodies of some with stinging-nettles, causing others to kneel with bare knees on hot pipes, or to go through, often without clothes, a system of refined torture which she had invented and called the "basket drill." The judge thought seriously of the offence, and sentenced the prisoner to five years' penal servitude. The public has thought seriously too, not only of the offender, but of the guardians, and the Local Government Board, which had created and countenanced a system under which such evils could be allowed to exist during nine years unknown and unchecked. To Ella Gilliespie we owe the public condemnation of barrack schools, as these large aggregations of children have been termed. Shocked by her action, the public demanded a Committee of Inquiry, and that body, appointed by Mr. Shaw Lefevre as President of the Local Government Board, and

composed as it was of persons of many shades of opinion, finished its labours some two years afterwards by unanimously condemning barrack schools.

A great deal has been said both for and against that report. Objectors have asserted that the committee was composed of persons who brought to the subject preconceived opinions. It is true that four out of the eight of those who had seats on the Departmental Committee of Inquiry were experts on Poor Law matters, but although experts they were not agreed; while the other four were unfamiliar with pauper schools. Angry guardians have declared that the report is not in accordance with the evidence; but it is surely not the duty of such an inquiry committee to listen to all, and then to write a sort of epitome of what has been said. The more judicial course is to weigh evidence, to study character and personality, to consider the value of the testimony of each witness, and to endeavour to appraise how far such evidence has been influenced by circumstances of training, interest, environment, or experience.

Again, it must not be forgotten that the members of the Committee made personal inspections, both of the Poor Law institutions and of kindred organisations, and thus saw and heard things impossible for witnesses to reveal. Witnesses with even the purest intention hesitate to criticise fellow-officers' work, or to expose faults in a system on which their livelihood depends. Examples are not wanting of the subsequent dismissal of those who have dared to point to abuses, subsequently generally disapproved. Henry Elliott, who first revealed the cause of the deaths of the children at Forest Gate,

was, after twenty-two years of honourable service, sent, unpensioned and disgraced, to a broken and poverty-haunted old age; and Mrs. Johnson, of the Herne Bay Schools, was spared a similar fate by the publicity given to her dismissal, which, according to the chairman, was due to her having given evidence against the superintendent and matron.

But if the Departmental Committee Report was strongly condemned by some persons, it has been highly commended by others. One "North Country Guardian" wrote to the *Times*:—

"The Committee's far-seeing suggestions and grip of the situation must strike those of us who have been struggling for years with just the evils they see in the present administration. I do not know how any one who has had experience of 'barrack schools' can think the report sensational or exaggerated; to me it reads like words of truth and soberness."

Miss Louisa Twining, a lover of Poor Law children, and a veteran in their service, wrote:—

"I have read and considered the report with great satisfaction and interest, as it seems to me to embody—perhaps for the first time in public reform—principles of the highest value and importance, the chief of these being the inestimable advantages of family life. It is a new charter for the emancipation and advancement in life of those who are now trained in our pauper schools.

"I hail it as a masterly exposition of reforms sorely needed, and am deeply grateful for the arduous labour bestowed by the witnesses, and in far larger measure by the Committee to which we owe it"; while Miss F. Davenport-Hill, herself an

authority on the matter, wrote that "two lady guardians familiar with one of our large barrack schools have told me that the fault they find with the report is that it is not strong enough."

In any case, rightly or wrongly, the Committee was unanimous in condemning barrack schools. It condemned them because it was shown that among children aggregated in large numbers the standard of health was lower than among those living under ordinary conditions. In proof of which it may be mentioned (1) that out of 16,441 children in metropolitan schools, no less than 1,330, or 8 per cent., were unable to attend the examination on account of illness; (2) that on my visit with Sir Joshua Fitch to the Sutton Schools we found that no less than 38 per cent. of the children, in one form or another, were disabled by sickness; (3) that according to published statements there have since been lately serious outbreaks of ophthalmia in several of the large schools; and (4) that in Leavesden, which is certainly one of the best managed of these institutions, the medical officer's figures showed the number of sick children isolated from the healthy to be no less than 115 out of a total of 672.

The Committee condemned barrack schools because much weighty testimony, including that of inspectors and medical officers, showed that they tended to make the children "dull, sullen, and mechanical," depriving them thus both of the joy of childhood and of subsequent strength in manhood. What child can be childlike who lives by rules; who obeys, not for love's sake, but for necessity's sake; who has no room for choice or

for adventure, no experience for imagination? What child so drilled can gather the strength which holds impulse and passion in check?

Barrack schools, therefore, stand condemned, and not only by the Departmental Committee, but by the spirit of the time which considers child nature, and knows that the joyousness of freedom is as necessary for growth in power and love as the discipline of control.

But how are things to be changed? That is really the question.

For years those who have watched or cared for these subjects have known that this system has not been the one best suited to meet the children's needs. This is no new opinion, nor one confined to our country. Every nation excepting England has abolished its barrack schools, Sir Richard Windyce declaring that in New South Wales they keep one which cost £100,000 as an interesting monument of the stupidity of its founders.

It is useless trying to perfect the system, or to strengthen the administration. Paradoxical as it sounds, everybody who loves childhood and understands one little child will recognise the truth of Miss Brodie-Hall's statement that the more flawlessly a school is managed, the worse it is for the child. The very perfection of organisation which makes it possible to offer the visitor the pretty picture of 700 or 1,000 children, all clean, all in order, all respectful, all disciplined, is fatal to the child's freedom. It has robbed him of that possibility of choice necessary to the development of character which lies at the root of self-respect.

It is useless also to continue to abuse the

guardians and managers, many of whom (and I speak as one of them with a nineteen years' experience) have given generously of their time, strength, and thought in the endeavour to do their duty to the children. In many cases they have found, not founded the schools, and during the inquiry it was noticeable how many witnesses were ready to place the figure of their ideal school lower than the number with which they had had actual experience.

Thus Mr. Wainwright, the kindly and respected chairman of the Anerley District Schools, which contained 847 children, thought that a school of 500 or 600 should be the outside number, and even then that it should be divided into sections. Dr. Littlejohn, whose duty it was to supervise something like 1,000 young ones, did not think "that any school should have more than 500 children at the outside, or if you could make them schools of 250 it would be better." Miss Baker, who has dealt with 486 children, put 300 as her maximum. Mr. Brown, a manager of a school of 700, would be sorry to see more than 200 or 300 under any circumstances. Mr. Crooks, as a past boy in the Sutton Schools, where there were over 1,000 boys in one building, put 300 as his limit, and then in the hope that they would be "broken up"; and Mr. Harston, whose twenty-seven cottage homes contain respectively twenty-six to forty, would like to see the number limited to twelve.

It would seem as if each one who grappled with the difficulty felt that it was the number that made the problem insoluble in practice, and as that was lowered each person in turn asked for a yet smaller group of children.

"However excellent the intention of officials, it is *impossible* in those large schools for anybody, no matter who they are, to manage them so as in any way to touch the children as individuals, even to know their names," was the opinion of a respected member of the Metropolitan Asylums Board.

It is useless also to go on urging guardians to classify the children so as to minimise some of the evils which are consequent on the mingling of all sorts together. Putting it roughly, there are thirteen classes of children.

I. *The children with ophthalmia*, who, again, should be subdivided into the many classes which Dr. Stephenson found necessary at the Hanwell Ophthalmic School. However, for present purposes we can count all ophthalmic children as one class.

II. *The children with ringworm.*—These are often in average good health, but as they have an infectious disease they are necessarily excluded from school, and in most cases are left entirely idle.

III. *The scrofulous children.*—These require sea air, extra care about diet, and a life so arranged as to be much out of doors. At present only the worst cases are sent occasionally to Margate.

IV. *The mentally afflicted children.*—What can be done for this class has been shown by the wonderful work of the London School Board. In the pauper schools the feeble-minded are left with the normal children, frequently to the serious disadvantage of both.

V. *The deaf, dumb, and blind.*—For these, also, the Local Government Board have made no arrangements, handing them over to the Educa-

tion Department, in whose homes they are kept and suitably educated.

VI. *The crippled children.*—In pauper schools there is no provision for this class. The charitable homes receive them (when there are vacancies), and the guardians pay towards their maintenance.

VII. *The ins and outs.*—These are the children of the tramp, the beggar, and the reprobate. They come in and out of the workhouse sometimes, as Mr. Lockwood, the Local Government Board inspector, witnessed, as frequently as once a week. They often do not get further than the workhouse, but when they do come to the schools they bring much evil and a bright energy which causes their influence to be additionally dangerous and infectious.

VIII. *The occasional occupant.*—This class, with that of the ins and outs, comprise the largest in the schools, no fewer than 63 per cent. of the whole number of children being admitted and discharged during the year.

IX. *The orphan and deserted children.*—These include both the children of respectable, decent people, and also those of deserting parents, who are often worthless.

X. *The children of respectable widows.*—If the father dies, the widow is often told to send all her family, excepting two, into the schools. Poverty commands compliance, but good homes are frequently broken up by this practice, and no institution can supply the place of a good mother.

XI. *The boys who need trade training.*—We have it on the evidence of the Local Government Board inspector that in most of the schools the technical training is practically useless, the boys only learning to "botch and cobble."

XII. *The girls who need technical training.*—A few are taught in the small training kitchens, in the few schools where they exist, but the great majority are employed in domestic labour of the class that can be of no use to them when they go out into the world. Washing by machinery, cooking by steam, scrubbing in battalions, is not domestic training; and, as it has been found, a large majority of the girls trained in pauper schools are considerably handicapped in life by their ignorance of the usages of ordinary small households.

XIII. *The morally depraved class.*—This is a small class, but a terribly injurious one. In large schools sins spread like fevers, and Dr. Barnardo's statement that "very few girls come from Poor Law institutions who have not been more or less contaminated" is borne out by recent revelations, which vividly showed (as the accused were acquitted) the depth of iniquity into which boys can fall in imagination, lying, and cupidity.

Hitherto, with a few exceptions, all these thirteen classes of children have been treated alike. The big establishment is there, the child becomes chargeable, the guardians are satisfied with the aggregated system of education, so to the school each child is sent—the quiet, home-protected widow's darling to mix with the sturdy little rebel of the streets; the crippled boy to stand in corners and watch the work or rough romping in which he cannot share; the mentally feeble to develop or deteriorate among the normally minded; the morally depraved to do his worst amid the innocent; the nervous child to suffer all the pains of a crowd; the hard girl to be left unsoftened by affection; the

loving lad to be steeled into indifference; while the dreariness of the position of the child afflicted with ophthalmia or ringworm has to be seen to be realised. Perhaps he will be alone in the ward, without school, without playmates, without any resource beyond what he can find in his isolation ward. If he has three or four companions he is still left without education, and has only the limited playground of an enclosed yard.

All this should not be so, and yet the guardians are, to a large extent, helpless, for what can they do? Already each child in the school costs £29 5s. 6d. per annum, already £1,207,398 has been sunk in the buildings, and for £517,737 the ratepayers still continue to pay interest. If any Board of Guardians decided to classify its children, what would the ratepayers say if it commenced to build, hire, or otherwise organise thirteen different establishments, each provided with suitable heads, doctors, skilled trade teachers, or other experts? The expense would be the first barrier, but the second would be the impracticability of the scheme, for no one Board would have enough children of various classes to make it advisable to maintain so many different kinds of schools, and probably few Boards would have the time, skill, or knowledge to organise or superintend them.

It is useless, therefore, to continue to abuse the guardians for not reforming the system. They cannot do it. Even if they were dissatisfied with their present methods, even if they were willing to surrender the rights which they consider their past work has conferred on them, even if they were enlightened and progressive educationists eager for

reform, they could not do it. It must be done for them. On this point the Departmental Committee were practically unanimous. Its report said:—

"The evidence laid before us upon this subject convinces us that no radical improvement in the management of the Poor Law children of the metropolis will ever be carried out uniformly and consistently under the present system, however excellent the *personnel* of the Boards of Guardians may be. We have arrived at the conclusion that the first step towards improvement is the securing of unity and strength in the authority charged with the control of the schools. We therefore recommend the appointment of a central authority for the metropolis."

It is this suggestion which has so angered the guardians, all the more, perhaps, because among those who support it are two of the most experienced and trusted inspectors of the Local Government Board, Dr. Bridges and Mr. Holgate, who have known these schools for the last twenty-five years, and who noted with generous praise the improvements made in them. Mr. Holgate considers that "the existing Boards are in too many cases not suitably selected for the best interests of the schools, [and he does not see how any improvement can be effected] unless some change is made in taking them from Boards of Guardians."

The same inspector also points out that "jealousy between the Boards is so extreme that it is almost impossible to weave them together in one, . . . to get any one result such as head or peripatetic instructors in special subjects," and he gave as his

opinion that "having a Central Board or special committee is the only way by which we can advance the schools to the position they ought to take in those matters."

Dr. Bridges says: "I have never known the most ignorant Board of Guardians with whom I have come into contact animated with anything except exceedingly kindly feelings towards the children; but often from want of perception, from want of knowing really how children ought to be brought up, they have not seen the necessity of a great number of recommendations."

Mr. Chaplin, in a debate in the House of Commons, amid much that was complimentary to his Departmental Committee, twitted it because it had recommended a Central Board and omitted to mention how it was to be constituted. There are several ways by which such a Board could be called into being. It might be a committee of the London County Council, composed on the same lines as the old Technical Education Board, liberty being accorded to co-opt experts, and care taken that many of these should be women. It might be a Board composed of representatives of the guardians, the London County Council, and the Metropolitan Asylums Board, added to either by nominated or co-opted women or experts. These are various methods of constituting such a Central Metropolitan Board, but without pausing to discuss their respective merits, we will imagine such a Board existing and in possession of all the buildings, equipments, appliances, staff, already existing, and now under the control of twenty-nine different authorities. To this Board would be given, as the Departmental

Committee recommends, "the absolute care of the children as long as they remain chargeable to the State."

There can be little doubt that the first effort of such a body would be to get rid of some of the largest of the schools—a matter that need not be counted as insurmountably difficult, inasmuch as the Asylums Board is ever demanding more room, and these palatial institutions, fully equipped as they are with appliances for monster laundry, serving and cooking operations, could be suitably adapted for lunatic asylums, imbecile refuges, or able-bodied workhouses. For one or other of these purposes the large schools at Sutton, Banstead (girls), Hanwell, Ashford, and Leavesden might be disposed of; while for the value of their sites, situated in what have become populous neighbourhoods, the institutions at Anerley, Norwood, Forest Gate, and Holloway might be remuneratively sold. The Central Board would then be left with twelve institutions, the largest, Leytonstone, housing 556 children; the smallest, Herne Bay, with accommodation for 166. These could be adapted to meet the needs of the many different classes of children. One establishment could be used as a trade training school for boys of fourteen, where they could be trained thoroughly, scientifically, and on such lines as to ensure them becoming skilled workmen.

A second school—ay! and I am afraid, for some time to come, a third too—would be wanted for ophthalmic hospitals, while a fourth could be used as a school for all those who are suffering from ringworm.

Another school, one, for preference, which consists

of a group of cottages each containing thirty children, could be used as a trade training school for girls, where they would be taught washing, dressmaking, book-keeping, type-writing, the use of the sewing-machine, or what is necessary for domestic service, or such other capacity as their characters and capabilities seem specially to design them.

Into a few of these cottages might be drafted the blind, deaf and dumb, and crippled, who must to a certain extent be grouped together in order to secure for them the training which is essential if they are ever to become independent or feel of any use in the world; but this isolation could be brightened if some babies were sent to share the homes, and the elder girls, in getting their domestic training among these afflicted ones, would gain, perhaps unconsciously, the still more valuable training of sympathy, tact, and patience.

The remaining schools could be used for the casual occupant (Class VIII.) and the ins and outs, but if the recommendations of the Poor Law Schools Committee were carried out, the class ins and outs proper (Class VII.) would be much reduced, as the central authority would be empowered to retain and exercise control over "neglected children who have been maintained at the cost of the rates."

So far, then, we have seen how the central authority would dispose of some of its buildings and utilise others, but we have not yet planned how to provide for the many thousands of children who would be displaced from these large schools. There are now four ways, and as the idea gained root that these children should be reared in segregated homes,

and not in monster institutions, other methods would present themselves, and would be accepted or rejected by the public and the Central Board, in proportion as they approached to the ideal of children living in homes and being absorbed into the general population. The four methods are: (*a*) boarding-out; (*b*) certified homes; (*c*) emigration; (*d*) scattered homes.

The advantages of boarding-out are so obvious that I feel almost apologetic for mentioning them. They can be briefly summarised as affecting (1) *the children;* (2) *the villagers;* (3) *the ratepayers.*

For a child to live in a workman's cottage, under the charge of a philanthropic committee, means a home during childhood's years, a place in some one's heart, a friend in a higher class of society, neighbours and playfellows among the respectable industrial classes, and the loss of all connection with pauperism.

For the villagers to have the care of these children means a small but regular weekly payment, the company of the child, and the added interest which comes from the frequent visits of the superintending lady, who with deeper understanding and higher culture takes her share in the care of the child.

For the ratepayers it is cheaper to spend £13 a a year than £29, and more satisfactory to know that not only is the work better done at the time, but that all capital charges are rendered unnecessary, and that the child will, unless under exceptional circumstances, be so absorbed into the industrial population as not again to become dependent on the rates.

It has been said that it would not be possible to

find sufficient foster-parents willing to take a much larger number of children than are now boarded-out. The statement is a reflection on English villages not, I think, justified by experience. The committee of the Country Holidays Fund had in 1896, at one time, 15,000 children spending their fortnight's holiday in villages within one hundred miles of London. The homes were in every case those of respectable country people, selected by responsible neighbours, and capable of offering decent accommodation and friendly mothering. The cottagers might not always have been willing to take permanent children, but the villages used by the fund form but a proportion of those in which equally good cottages might be found. Scotland boards out 84 per cent. of its State-supported children. In Switzerland 74·2 per cent. dwell in the homes of working people. In Germany, since 1878, the boarding-out of State-supported children has become compulsory. Belgium treats its barrack schools only as depôts before boarding-out. France, Italy, Holland, Massachusetts, South Australia, Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland, and Canada rear their children in a similar way, and yet from London only 5 per cent. are boarded-out, and in all England less than 2 per cent. Almost all other nations trust the people with the State-supported children. It would surely be an insult to our peasantry to declare them to be unworthy of a similar confidence. Unwilling, they are not. As it has been said to me more than once in visiting a boarded-out child, "You ladies can do a lot of charity, but we poor women can only do ours by minding the child."

I would not have it thought that I am advocating

universal boarding-out, because my knowledge of the London poor has taught me that to send some pauper children into a village would be neither good for them nor for the village. To rear normal children there can be but little doubt that boarding-out is the best system; but besides the physically disabled there are difficult children, children with crooked tempers, unlovable ways, ill-balanced natures, eager, unrestrained mortals with tendencies towards evil. There are also ultra-sensitive children with nerves which are the legacy of drink; stubborn, wilful children whose instinct is to refuse love. Many of these cannot be boarded out, but must be dealt with by other and varied ways.

The advantages of boarding-out may, however, be readily conceded, and yet the relation between its extension and the Central Board not be readily observed. The chief reason, beyond the fond preference for their own institutions, why Boards of Guardians do not board-out is the uncertainty as to where to send the child, or with whom they are to deal. The mode of procedure is as follows: If there is an eligible child, the guardians' clerk writes round to the various boarding-out committees, who in the course of time reply. One has no foster-parent ready, another is away from home, a third can only take a boy, a fourth declines unless the child is of a given age, well-favoured, or absolutely healthy, a fifth has another obstacle, and so the correspondence drags on until the clerk finds it simpler, and he is therefore apt to consider it probably more satisfactory, to send the orphan child to the large school.

The same difficulties are felt with regard to

Certified Homes. It is within the powers now of the guardians to send the children to these small schools, paying 5s. to 7s. per week for each child; but how is it possible for every Board to keep touch with the changes in the management which make one school suitable at one time for a troublesome child and useless at another? They cannot write round to all the 211 institutions to ascertain where there are vacancies. This is too much to expect from a Board already over-weighted, as each one is, with a casual ward, an infirmary, and an able-bodied house; so a child whose whole character and future might be changed by wise individual attention is perforce condemned to the mechanical discipline of a monster school.

But a Central Authority, with the children only as its care, could easily remain *en rapport* with the Certified Schools, and as it would necessarily have their inspection in its hands, it could use such influence as was necessary to induce them to become more elastic, in order to meet the requirements of a changing class.

In Canada there is not only boundless room for the children, but they are wanted and needed. Mr. S. Smith, M.P., said: "We find no difficulty whatever, when the children are properly trained before they come out, in placing out any number."

Dr. Barnardo, Mr. Wallace, the Hon. Mrs. Joyce, have all testified that homes are ready for the children, and hearts ready to receive them. The reason of this is explained by Mr. Smith, who said: "A great many Canadian farmers have no children in their own homes; they marry early, the children grow up, they settle in life early, they go away from

home. You very often find a couple living alone, their children having left them, and they feel very dull, not having any one in the house, and they are very glad to have children for company."

Major Grettan, whose long experience both in East London and in Canada has given him special opportunities for a right judgment, expressed the strongest belief in the emigration of children.

It is not as if Canada were not our own. To banish our forlorn ones ever seems to be an un-Christlike action, but Canada is part of England, and with its miles of virgin soil, its clear skies, its hope-stimulating air, its honest, simple-living population, it is specially fitted to be the nursery of our redundant childhood. All the more so as the country cries out for them, and will repay their labour as they grow fit to give it.

So fully has the Sheffield system of Scattered Homes been described, that there is no need to discuss it in detail. But I would say that it seems specially fitted for adoption in London suburbs, where there are hundreds—indeed, I should be within the mark if I said thousands—of ladies willing and capable of being the managers of little groups of children if placed under a matron in their immediate vicinity. The teaching part of the education could be provided, as at Sheffield, by the nearest elementary school, and the children would join in the games, interests, and pleasures of the neighbourhood; while their religious instruction would be imparted, as is that of other children when living with their parents, by the clergyman of the district. It would not, however, be well that the Scattered Home system should be the only one

adopted. It does not provide family life, nor a subsequent home for the child, but for those children who cannot be boarded-out or emigrated it would be very useful, and may be considered as an extension of small certified schools. In all cases where such homes are started, the interest of the neighbours and persons of good-will should be enlisted, for close and considerate supervision is absolutely necessary to secure success.

Under a Metropolitan Central Authority the history of a Poor Law child would then be as follows. On applying, the guardians would send it to a small receiving home, in close proximity to the workhouse. Here it would come under the care of a "Children's Committee," composed partly of guardians, partly of persons whose interests are educational. After inquiries had been made into the circumstances which had brought it on the rates, or the probable length of its dependence on them, it would be drafted to one of the receiving homes of the Central Metropolitan Authority, and sent, after a sufficient quarantine, wherever it seemed best.

If he or she is boarded-out, it will be with the hope of returning to one of the trade training schools.

If she is feeble-minded, she will go to the little home specially provided under skilled medical care.

If he is an "in and out" he will be counted as a ward of the State, and rigorously kept from his unworthy parents—anyhow, until they show signs of their ability and intention of keeping him as a human being, and not worse than a dog.

If she is a casual occupant, and has become dependent only because "father has had a bad

accident," or her mother broken in health, she will either be boarded-out as a visitor, not as a permanent member of the family, or go to one of the scattered homes or smaller schools for the four, five, or six months she is likely to be chargeable.

If he is a bad boy he will go to a discipline school, there to learn the lesson of the world, that laws must be abided by or pain will follow; but if he is only a rebellious lad, with a sound nature, but no scope for his wild spirits, he can be drafted on to a ship, and later help to man the "wooden walls" of England.

If she is a small, undergrown, nervous girl she can be sent to school by the sea, and emerge fit to earn her bread; but if she is big, strong, and quite untrained, the trade training school can receive her and prepare her for her life's work.

In many different ways the many different children will be dealt with, the principle being maintained that all ways are in so far good as they conform towards family life, or, to quote the veteran and revered Poor Law reformer, Miss Twining, "family life and affection is the foundation of all social welfare and morality," and to obtain it for the homeless is the duty of the State.

The question arises, If and when this Metropolitan Central Board is instituted, under which State department should it be placed? A good deal has been said about a special department for Poor Law children, under the Local Government Board, but this does not appeal to me as wise on several grounds.

I. Because it would keep the children in touch with pauper officials and their ideas, which are

rightly and necessarily those of repression and not development.

II. Because it would make the children a class apart, a pauper class under special regulations and restrictions, dissociated, therefore, from other children and less likely to be absorbed into the general population.

III. Because the Local Government Board, not being in touch with the development of educational methods, would not bring to bear the best methods on those most in need of such methods.

IV. Lastly, because the Local Government Board have hitherto failed to do well by the children.

This is a grave charge, but it can be abundantly substantiated.

For years the Local Government Board allowed the guardians to break the law of the land in working children of all ages, and regardless of their educational standard, as half-timers. In some schools they began to labour as young as eight or nine, and it is to be noted not at work which was instructive and educational, but which their own inspectors respectively denounced as "drudgery" for the girls, and "very unsatisfactory" for the boys.

Since 1862 it was known that when large numbers of children were aggregated a lower vitality prevailed, and that ophthalmia was rarely absent. Let us consider Hanwell. In 1870 Mr. Nettleship reported that nearly 80 per cent. of the children had been afflicted by ophthalmia. In 1888 Dr. Bridges reported that in thirteen years there had been 2,649 cases, only 539 being imported from

outside. In 1890, out of 993 children in the schools, 576 were on the sick-list, 344 from ophthalmia. The ophthalmic history of other schools has been almost as tragic; but although the Local Government Board knew these facts from its own inspectors, it continued to allow the schools to be enlarged, and even as late as October of 1896 granted permission to add to the buildings of one of its unwieldy schools.

The problem of the "in and out" child is no new problem. In 1889 Dr. Bridges computed that 63·64 per cent. of the entire population of these schools came in and went out during each year; while Mr. Lockwood, the Local Government inspector, prepared a table which showed "particulars of eleven families representing the more prominent 'ins and outs' for Marylebone Workhouse. . . . One family of three children, between the 3rd of October, 1893, and the 19th of November, 1894, were in and out of the workhouse, admitted and discharged, sixty-two times. . . . Another family of four were in and out forty-three times in that period, and another has been in and out of the workhouse between the 25th of July and the 21st of November, 1894, sixteen times."

For years it has been known that the system which allows the ratepayer to support the child, and the parents to claim it as soon as it has reached a wage-earning age, is injurious to the child and unfair to the ratepayer; but the Local Government Board has made no effort to reform the system, nor to obtain for the guardians or itself increased powers

of control over these vagrant children or worthless parents.

In 1844 the Act permitting the foundation of district schools was passed in order to remove the children from the contaminating influences of the workhouse; but in London, according to the evidence of the Local Government Board inspector, there are over 3,000 children in the workhouses, for the most part in daily contact with the adult paupers and deprived of any adequate education, and yet it is difficult to discover any steps which the Local Government Board have taken to remedy this deplorable condition of things.

It is well known, and when in Canada I learnt the same fact from personal investigation, that the Canadian farmers are eager to adopt poor children, but such are the arrangements which the Local Government Board made for the pauper children that they preferred the street waifs of Liverpool to the State-supported children. The philanthropic societies demanded for their children a regulated and rising rate of wages. The Local Government Board demanded none. The philanthropic societies required of the farmers who take these children that they should give them a certain specified amount of education. The Local Government Board made no such requirement. Over and above these stipulations, Dr. Barnardo found it necessary to inspect the children he placed out three or four times a year, and to provide for them receiving homes to which they could be sent in case of a change in the family's circumstances. The Local Government

Board made no such inspection and provided no such receiving homes. "As a matter of fact," said Mr. Knollys, the chief official of the Local Government Board, "the emigration officers are supposed to make an annual report, but we do not receive more than one report on each child." Poor babe! sent out alone at six or eight or ten to a strange land, looked after once by its fond foster-parent, the State, and once only. Is it to be wondered at that, as there is no receiving home for these emigrated children, they have been found in doss-houses in Montreal, and that Canada not unnaturally objects to be the dumping-ground of what England's carelessness of it proves she considers to be rubbish?

Feeble-minded children are not a new discovery. They have ever existed as the product of drink, vice, and semi-starvation. In October, 1894, the Local Government Board caused their medical officers to make an inquiry into the number who were in the provincial workhouses and infirmaries, and to state what proportion were, in their opinion, likely to be benefited by special treatment. The figures returned were 485, of whom it was said 178 could be aided by suitable training.

But the Local Government Board have done nothing for this class of children. Although they are not eligible for the imbecile asylums, they can, under sympathetic care, be made happy, if not very useful, members of the community.

When I consider the courtesy of the Presidents and of the Local Government Board officials with whom I have the privilege of acquaintance, when

I remember the colossal dimensions of their labours (the medical inspector being supposed to be responsible for 74,000 beds), I feel regret at having to bring so heavy an indictment against the Local Government Board; but the truth is best known, and what it all amounts to is that children, with their tender natures, their delicate balance between good and evil, their insistent demands for individual treatment, are not an appropriate item in the immense organisation which has to do with drains, vagrants, asylums, guardian boards and workhouses, election orders, sanitary authorities, dangerous trades, and workshop inspection.

The atmosphere of thought which is engendered by the consideration of these matters is not the best through which to see a little child's interests, nor in which to unravel the intricacies of educational principles and practices. Children are best dealt with by experts, and by a department which has only to do with education. In this relation it is noteworthy that Sir Godfrey Lushington, as chairman of a Departmental Committee of Inquiry into Industrial and Reformatory Schools, has recommended that they all be transferred from the Home Office to the Education Department. The arguments that he has used apply with equal, if not greater, force to Poor Law children. He contended that the object of such schools is "to restore the children to society, and that they should, as far as possible, be prevented from feeling themselves to be a class apart"; and he asserted that "the general training of these children, as distinguished from schoolroom instruction, is the work of education in

its broadest sense"; and that "the Home Office has nothing to do with education" (which, indeed, is equally true of the Local Government Board), "whilst the Education Department has its entire interest in the problem of the education of the young."

Sir Godfrey held that an inspector inspecting this class of children, and no other, becomes "prone to acquiesce in the standard of such general training as he finds to be commonly prevailing in these schools," whereas if the children were inspected by different inspectors in different parts of the country, who are accustomed to inspect the children of the ordinary population, they would "be quick to note and correct any tendency to treat the children as a class apart," and the views of the department would be formed from various and experienced sources.

These opinions should carry much weight; all the more so, because they also were held for many years by so experienced a statesman as Lord Norton, and are now maintained by the large body of persons who have associated themselves under the name of the State Children's Aid Association. With Viscount Peel at its head, that association was started to try and obtain for the children of the State what, after all, is every human creature's inalienable right—the right to be treated as an individual.

1897.

THE WORKHOUSE

The workhouse is the terror of the poor. The thought of it haunts the young home maker, lest by illness or by loss of work he and his be driven to its shelter. The fear of it makes the old endure hardship and semi-starvation rather than apply for admission.

Why, it may be asked, does such terror exist? The workhouse offers warmth and food and cleanliness. Every inmate has a bed with sufficient covering, clothes for indoor and for outdoor wear, and regular meals arranged under medical authority. There is enough work for exercise, and there is ample leisure for talk and for sleep. There is a doctor in attendance ready to provide everything in case of illness, and at stated periods every one who does not lose the privilege by misconduct has the right to go out for a few hours to visit friends.

What is the hardship that people who have lost everything should have such means freely provided? Why is the workhouse a terror? The answer lies in a word—the workhouse stands for the punishment of poverty. It is akin to a prison, and its inmates feel themselves treated as criminals, when they have committed no crime.

The Reformers of 1834, who invented the work-

house, faced a condition of things which had been brought about by the Elizabethan system of Poor Law relief. When the State assumed the whole responsibility "for the relief of the impotent and the getting to work of those able to work," and when by Gilbert's Act in 1827 it was further enacted that out-relief should be made "obligatory for all except the sick and impotent," it followed that larger and larger numbers threw themselves on the State for their support. Relief offered a better living than work. The number of workers decreased, the number receiving relief increased. Ruin threatened the nation, and so the Reformers of 1834 felt that the *one* thing necessary was to force the people to choose work instead of seeking relief. They required that every applicant for relief should give evidence of destitution, they refused relief to able-bodied persons except on the sacrifice of their liberty, and they made the form of relief as unpleasant or as deterrent as possible.

The Reformers, therefore, with a view to spurring the people to effort, and partly perhaps with the thought of punishing the idle, invented the workhouse, and shaped it after the model of a prison. The building was always of a gloomy and severe order. A porter in uniform like a prison warder opened and closed the door—the rooms were called "wards"—a "workhouse" dress was enforced, and the work, strictly supervised, was "a task," chosen not because of its use, but because of its distastefulness. There was a crank to turn, or stones to break, or oakum to pick.

This system has been followed during the last seventy years, and the latest so-called improvement

is to impose on a "casual" solitary confinement in a cell, in which he is locked with a heap of stones, which he must break small enough to throw through a grating at the end of his cell. The workhouse has been made to look like a prison, and its discipline has been modelled on that of the prison.

The harshness of the new Poor Law roused at the time loud protests, which are echoed in the literature of the day, but the harshness may have been necessary. The nation required a sharp spur, and no doubt under its pressure there was a marvellous recovery. Men who had been idle sought work, men who had saved realised that their savings would no longer be swallowed up in the rates. The spur and the whip had their effect, but the workhouse still continues to be a terror to those who have no need of spur and whip.

The Reformers of 1834 looked out on a society weakened by idleness, they faced a condition of things in which the chief thing wanted was energy and effort, and so they applied a stimulus.

The Reformers of to-day look out on a different society, and they look with other eyes. They see that the weak and the poor are not altogether suffering the penalty of their own faults. It is by others' neglect that uninhabitable houses have robbed them of strength, that wages do not provide means of living, and that education has not fitted them either to earn a livelihood or to enjoy life. The Reformers of to-day, under the subtle and often unacknowledged influence of the Christian spirit, have learnt that self-respect, even more than a strong body, is a man's best asset, that willing work rather than forced work makes

national strength, that terror is mischievous and that force is no remedy.

The "workhouse" as a place of punishment is thus out of place in modern society. It is not punishment, it is training which the people need, and it is not a whipping, but sympathy, which their brothers should provide. The workhouse to-day rouses resentment. The working classes, who dread it as a terror, are conscious that it is unjust that they should be punished for misfortune; the inmates who are forced to seek its shelter are in an attitude of antagonism. They are sullen, wasteful of their food, discontented, and set on doing as little work as possible. Many, indeed, having lost all self-respect, have become habitués, and, so far from avoiding the place, rely on the help it affords. There is no sadder sight than that offered by a ward in a workhouse. In its deadly cleanliness men and women are gathered without human interest and without hope. They feel themselves to be not wanted, a mere burden on the rates, whose death means gain. Unloved by man, they hardly believe in the love of God. The workhouse has thus to a large extent become a centre of degradation, and when it is remembered that in the workhouses, under the influence of their resentful and often degraded inmates, there remain still some 22,000 children, the need of some change will be recognised.

The necessary change, it seems to me, is that the workhouse should now be modelled not on a prison but on a school, and that its object should be not punishment but training. This change would at once commend itself to the national

conscience. The people who, on account of weakness or of ignorance or of the fluctuations of trade, have missed their vocation, would be given a chance of reinstating themselves. The people who are idle, and refuse to take advantage of the opportunity, would be justly detained, so that they might, during two or three years under discipline, learn something of the pleasure or profit of work.

The workhouses would, in fact, become Adult Industrial Schools, with workshops or with farms attached. There would be no suggestion of prison treatment, but there would be, as in schools, fixed hours for work, and for those who did not work there would be "keeping in" for long periods, in which the lessons would have to be learned.

This Adult Industrial School would, I believe, serve the object of the Reformers of 1834, and be as deterrent as the prison system then invented. The thought of learning, the limitation of time for gossip, and the atmosphere of work would be effective in preventing too easy a resort to its shelter. The inveterate idler prefers punishment to training, because he adapts both his body and conscience to its infliction. He cannot so easily settle down in a school, which makes fresh and fresh calls on effort, and aims at bringing out the best in every one. Task work sets up a spirit of rebellion. Work which has an object, which unconsciously carries on the mind of the worker to something done, enlivens his mind, and raises his self-respect.

The workhouse of to-day helps to demoralise society. Its harshness sets up among the poor a sense of unjust treatment, and encourages the rich,

by doles of food, by shelters, and by free breakfasts, to save the poor from seeking its shelter. The sense of injustice poisons opinion, and is accountable for an attitude towards the present governing classes which in its turn is unjust. It is no wonder that when the poor think themselves to be punished for their poverty they should be sympathetic with any proposal which offers them more wealth. The sense of injustice is often the source of unjust acts. The harshness of the workhouse in like manner demoralises the charity of the rich, leading it aside from remedial action to actions which encourage idleness and hypocrisy. It is no wonder that the rich man who sees a starving neighbour hesitates to send him to a place of punishment—he gives him a shilling, subscribes to a shelter, and encourages begging.

If the workhouse were known to be a means by which those who had lost their way in industrial life could be again placed in the way, the working classes would recognise the justice which would convict the unwilling to periods of detention, and the richer classes would refuse to let their relief stand between the beggar and the means which would restore him to self-respecting ways of living.

The spirit of Christ requires that the Christian community should act as a community to raise the fallen. Thought without love is often brutal, and the thought which aimed only to spur the idle has brutalised many natures. But love without thought is weakness, and the love which gives food for the asking, and aims to make relief as pleasant as possible, has simply increased poverty and wretchedness. The raising of the fallen is

still the greatest of problems, and it still demands the love which is most costly. Maybe, this is the love which thinks, because nothing helps so much and involves such sacrifice as thought. The success of the effort about to be made to reform the Poor Law depends, I suggest, on a public opinion which is directed by thinking love.

1908.

SOME PRINCIPLES OF THE POOR LAW

The report of the Poor Law Commission issued in 1834 begins thus: "It is now our painful duty to report that the fund which the 43d of Elizabeth directed to be employed in setting to work children and persons capable of labour, but using no daily trade, and in the necessary relief of the impotent, is applied to purposes opposed to the letter, and still more to the spirit, of the law, and destructive to the morals of that most numerous class, and to the welfare of all."

Legislation followed the issue of this epoch-making report, and the Bill which was introduced into the House of Lords by Lord Brougham, and supported by the Duke of Wellington, laid down two leading principles:—

I. That the condition of the pauper ought not to be more desirable than that of the independent labourer; or, to quote the words of an Assistant Commissioner, "the hanger-on ought not to be raised higher than him on whom he hangs."

II. That the accident of locality should not unduly affect the pauper, who should receive uniform treatment in all districts.

Thus were established the two great principles now known as—

"The Principle of less Eligibility";
"The Principle of National Uniformity."

To ensure that due effect should result from the labours and conclusions of the Commission, a Central Board was established "to control the local administration, to frame and enforce regulations as to the giving of relief, and to make those regulations uniform"; and it is to the Central Board, known first as the Poor Law Commission, later as the Poor Law Board, and now as the Local Government Board, that the nation owes such organisation as exists, as well as the confusion of aim, the variety of standard, and the uncertainty of administration which have brought Poor Law authorities into disrepute.

Whether we consider the relation of the Local Government Board to the young, to the old, to the sick, to the able-bodied, to the imbecile, or to the vagrant, we find affecting them all the same obscurity of vision, the same confusion of ideal, the same weakness of government, the same dilatoriness of action, the same indifference to the march and progress of economic conditions or the development of the national sense of responsibility. A few examples will serve to elucidate this accusation.

There are 69,080 children entirely dependent on the rates. Some Unions are allowed, if not encouraged, to build pauper villages, where, isolated from the normal life of the community, the children live in electricity-lit villa residences, where they cost as much as £1 0s. 6½d. each per week; other Unions are allowed, if not encouraged, to pay 1s. 6d. a week to a villager to feed, house, clean, and train

one of the assets of the nation. Some Unions are allowed, if not encouraged, to keep the children in the workhouses or infirmaries, mixing freely with degraded adults, learning of them by example unlovely habits and low standards; other Unions are allowed, if not encouraged, to erect palatial institutions where, at great cost, the children are reared, divorced from every adult, except the hired attendants and officials. Some Unions are allowed, if not encouraged, to pay 1s. or 1s. 6d. a week as out-relief; though, as one of their own inspectors pointed out in 1891, "if any relief at all is given to an applicant, it is the plain duty of the guardians to *take precautions* to insure that the pauper is sufficiently fed, clothed, and lodged"—not a superfluous reminder in view of the report of another of the Central Board officials, who in 1893 wrote: "In many Unions the relieving officer could show guardians cases where the accommodation is in almost every respect unsatisfactory, where the children have little but rags to cover them by day or night, where school attendance is avoided to the utmost, where the feeding only just escapes starvation, where the physical and moral education of the children are equally impracticable, and where infant life is one long struggle with misery and privation." And this condition of things does not affect a few children. On January 1, 1906, the number of outdoor pauper children was 179,890, rather more than half being widows' children and 10,345 being orphans — so adequately does the richest nation of the world carry out the Christian command to visit "the fatherless and widows in their affliction."

If this variety of treatment was seen only in the case of children, the excuse might be urged that the Central Authority was wishful to try various experiments in training this class of children, who, handicapped as they often are by parentage and environment, specially need carefully thought-out systems of education. But we find the same vacillation of policy affecting other classes of the indigent poor. For the sick the 646 Boards of Guardians are permitted, according to their fancies, to provide workhouse sick-wards, separate infirmaries of general character, specialised hospitals and sanatoria for particular diseases, subsidies to voluntary institutions, dispensaries, and domiciliary treatment, with or without nurses. The result is confusion in the public mind, and unequal treatment to the equally worthy sick poor. There are some infirmaries where skill and love were hourly united for the benefit of each decrepit old pauper; and there are infirmaries where classification is all but absent, and where to be sick is considered as almost a crime.

The widow is equally unable to feel security about her fate. In one Union she is refused outrelief; in others she is given 1s. and a loaf for each child; in another, 5s. for herself, 4s. for the first child, 3s. for the second, and 2s. for each additional member of her family. By some Boards she is made to part with her children and send them to the Union Schools; in others she and all her family are offered only refuge, food, and clothing, within "the House." If any official view has been expressed by the Central Authority on these treatments, the diversity of which

almost amounts to cruelty, I have yet to discover it.

If space allowed a full expansion of this aspect of the subject, I could show a similar confusion of policy and inconsistency of practice with regard to the able-bodied, the aged, the imbecile, the infirm, the blind, deaf, dumb, lame, and deformed. For them all different Unions have different methods, from the hard parting of Darby and Joan at the "House" gates, Darby to become one among the rows of corduroy-clad, dreary old men, Joan to join the groups of uniformed old women, whose work-room hands lie idly on their laps, to the almshouses specially designed and built for "deserving couples," who have paid rates and passed a certain number of years in the parish.

If the principles of 1834 had been repudiated after being carefully tested, the consequences would not have been so disastrous, but the Local Government Board have never either advised their abandonment or enforced their observance. The principle of Less Eligibility will at one time be enforced by degrading labour, such as stone-breaking, and ignored by the dietary table which provides bacon for breakfast, beer and tobacco at Christmas, and expenses for children's excursions. In the same Union one can find efforts to retain the workhouse test, while rendering it null and void by the provision of sentimental luxuries within the workhouse walls.

The principle of National Uniformity has been frankly abandoned, the Central Body contenting itself with keeping control over details which are comparatively unimportant, while allowing wide

divergencies of practice to be initiated and continued.

Just as the nation was disturbed before 1832 by the pass into which the lavish out-relief had brought the labouring population, the thoughtful are now disturbed at the confusion of principle and the lax administration by which £13,000,000 of the public money are annually expended on English paupers.

It is wearisome to write of errors, so it is well no longer to linger on the past, but to endeavour to obtain a new principle and walk in its light. The one I would suggest for consideration might be called "the principle of restoration to Industrial Efficiency." To accept such a principle for universal application would require some clearing of the mists of the mind, some destruction of time-honoured distinctions between "deserving" and "undeserving," some careful probing of the roots of charity, and some close examination of normal human relationships in a civilised community. But it might be interesting to accept the principle for awhile in order to bring to its test the varied classes of paupers who are at present dependent on the State.

Of the able-bodied men-paupers there are no less than 46,202, of whom some are in workhouses, some in casual wards, some in labour yards, some in farm colonies, some in a branch country workhouse. These various methods of relief are not provided for these men because it is thought that such and such a method is best for such and such a man, but because the Union to which he applied had happened to decide on that particular method

of relieving the able-bodied. But if the principle of "restoration to Industrial Efficiency" were adopted, the first thing to do would be to ascertain the causes of the able-bodied man's destitution, and then to place him in the best circumstances for restoration. "Able-bodied," I have written. What a cruel contradiction the word is to the gaunt creature which arises before those of us who know him individually, or have seen him as a stranded derelict before the workhouse gates or in the night-refuge queue—feeble-bodied, flabby-minded, crooked-souled would be the better description: thin, pale, self-respect absent from his face, gait, and manners, the pain of the hunted stamped on his features, the indifference born of frequent failures evident in his every movement. To restore him he would need food, air, clothes, and rest for his body; teaching, work, discipline, and control for his mind. The gift of faith and hope for his soul, all and each to be bestowed on him with a large charity and boundless patience. But it can be done, and there are social reformers ready and waiting to do it; firstly though the nation must be willing to believe in the possibility of such men's restoration; secondly, to pay for it; and thirdly (and this is the most alien to the present lawless attitude of public thought), to agree that he should be controlled while he is being restored to industrial efficiency, or permanently detained if he fails to attain to the standard by which he can support himself or is fit to call others into existence.

If the nation will boldly face the facts and determine to grapple with them, means can be found in a union of voluntary effort and State provision.

Each man's past character, circumstances, potentialities should be examined, his social disorder diagnosed, and the conditions best calculated to effect his cure provided for him. One man could be introduced to a labour bureau and encouraged to recover himself; another could be sent to a labour colony, adequate provision being allowed for his family during his period of convalescence or training; a third could be helped back to the land; a fourth trained in agriculture and emigrated; a fifth punished for the social crime of indolence; a sixth put to the severe disciplinary labour which alone can "sweat the devil out of him"; a seventh induced to be trained to work hitherto foreign to his experience; an eighth provided with possessions —a spur to conduct hitherto neglected; the principle through all the various methods which will be found necessary to resuscitate the manhood of the pauperised thousands being to restore health, regulate conduct, and develop skill, with the object of each individual man's restoration to Industrial Efficiency. And keeping step with this effort should walk the sister one of improving the conditions of industrial life, so that the man should have a desirable goal in front of him to stimulate his efforts. Is a dreary workshop, a single-roomed home, a dirty street, long working hours, low wages, monotonous days, uninteresting labour a goal desirable enough to rouse a man out of the lethargy of years, and to inspire him to the almost superhuman efforts necessary to recover his position and reconstruct his character? As he is, he is a danger as well as a disgrace to the community; his restoration to industrial efficiency is the com-

munity's interest. Does it not become, therefore, the community's responsibility to see that the conditions of the industrial life are fit for the man on whom it has expended time and treasure in restoring to industrial efficiency?

> "Give him money, you but give him pelf!
> Give him hope, and he'll restore himself,"

might be a parody of the old rhyme, and sums up my argument.

To carry out the principle of "restoration to Industrial Efficiency" of the old may seem impossible. How can the bent back be straightened, the shrivelled old hands strengthened, the dimmed eyes, the dulled ears, the slowed intellect be made again fit for the labour market? Had we not better be content to provide asylums for our old, even if we have to leave them sitting in rows in workhouse wards, divorced from life and its interests, dreary in spite of bright fires, their souls dumbed by want of daily incident, waiting for death of themselves or their companions as the only possible change in their lives? At least we know that they are clean and housed and fed; they have done their work and earned their rest. So argue those who consider the infirm pauper in the aggregate, and count absence of effort to be rest; but I have the privilege of claiming many of those little old women as my friends, and I know how even from the best and most kindly conducted workhouse they often turn longing eyes to the life outside; how they treasure every scrap of news of people they have

known or met; remember, to one's own shame, each trumpery little act of kindness; look and re-look at the grandchild's photograph, the Christmas greeting from "my gal whose got a family of her own now, and can't, in course, keep me," or the funeral card which "come as a surprise, as I hadn't heard Polly was a weakly babby." With such a capacity for interest in others, with such a wealth of unused affection, with decades of the homely wisdom born of experience, the industrial efficiency of the old consists in the fact of their being old. Take them out of the artificial life of Institutions, put them back among their families, and give them a pension, two-thirds of what they now cost to keep in the workhouses or infirmaries, and they will be restored to industrial efficiency, and become uncertificated teachers of these unscheduled virtues of patience, reverence, and consideration of the weak.

We banish into an eventless life behind high walls our most effective teachers and most patient nurses, and then wonder and bemoan that the big girls and boys are so rough and inconsiderate, and that the population is decimated by infant mortality. If half the old dears now in the workhouses were given 7s. a week, and their relations encouraged to support them (under inspection, if need be, until a standard for their comfort is created), it would do something towards the solution of the problem of infant mortality. If "Granny" were there to mind the baby and watch the children the rates of infant insurance would become lower, the family able to rent another room, and the coroner not have so frequently to sit on

burnt children and advise weeping mothers to buy fireguards. Loving and watching take time; they appear in no trade list as marketable commodities, but they are the stock-in-trade of the old; the nation needs their wares to be used in homes in making happiness, not left dormant in institutions where they are wasted.

In order to "restore the sick to industrial efficiency" the principles of Less Eligibility and the workhouse test must be wholly abandoned, and the principle of the right of the community to control the actions of the individual as fearlessly adopted. At present those of the sick who can get relief from hospitals do so; those who cannot, accept such assistance from the Poor Law; and as the ghost of the principle of Less Eligibility and the duty of saving the rates lurks in the corners of all board-rooms, the practice is generally adopted of encouraging the sick pauper to go out as soon as he is able. It would be well for the thoughtful to follow the results of this action on the community—of the consumptive man returned to his family, of the lying-in mother sent out when her babe is two weeks old, of the van-boy with a disordered heart discharged after rheumatic fever, or the factory hand during the convalescence from influenza. To adopt the principle of "restoration to Industrial Efficiency" would greatly change the relative positions of hospitals and infirmaries, and to the inmates of both there should, I venture to think, be unhesitatingly applied the principle of right of detention and control. How many girls have I seen go out of the lock wards when they "felt better" to spread sin and suffering, when powers

of detention would have kept them long enough to have broken their lawless connexions and discipline taught them self-control. To restore the sick to industrial efficiency would necessitate a large expenditure on convalescent homes, open-air sanatoria, &c., as well as much thought on methods of combining physical improvement and mental or industrial training; but already vast sums are spent on the disabled dependent, many of whom would, if under more thorough treatment when sick, be placed again among the independent and able.

In order to apply to children the "principle of restoration to Industrial Efficiency" one or two words must be altered—"preparation for" substitited for "restoration to"; and the first step to take is to remove them altogether from the pauper class. To allow a child either in his own mind or any one else's to be considered a pauper is to handicap his career. Many years ago I ventured to express in a short minority note to the Poor Law School Departmental Committee's report my hope that all children should be placed under the Education Board, whether they became chargeable to the State through the poverty of their parents, their own wrong-doing, or physical disability; and many years further experience and work among all classes of children has but strengthened that hope. Much time and energy have been used in the defence of barrack schools, or village communities, or other methods of rearing children undertaken by this or that Board of Guardians, but, broadly speaking, such defence is beside the mark. It is not whether this or that barrack school or

village community is as bad as it has been represented, but whether the system of aggregation of all the children of both sexes and all ages belonging to the Union which has selected that method is the best for each child whatever its capacities and tastes. The administration of an institution must not be confused with its purpose and its use. Strongly as I condemn the system, I can imagine a place for barrack schools as a method of education, not as institutions where all sorts of girls and boys are reared from the age of three to fifteen, but as trade training schools to which boys could be drafted after their childhood had been spent in a villager's family for, say, two years' friendly discipline and careful skilled training, such as Dr. Barnardo instituted for his boys by the seventeen trades taught in the big boarding-home at Stepney Causeway. I can imagine barrack-school superintendents not in attitudes of defensive resentment at the criticism made on the curtailment of liberty and the suppression of individuality—so bad an influence for children of all ages, though absolutely necessary where large numbers are aggregated—but I can picture that same superintendent positively proud of the discipline of his small army, while each boy's capacity is discovered, each lad's taste quickened, and each trade class encouraged to vie with another in producing evidence of individual initiation and proficiency. I can imagine a village community where the atmosphere would be alert with interest, used for a technical training school for all girls before they make their starts in life; schools where real proficiency would be striven for and attained—cooking, embroidery,

typing, housewifery, lacemaking, laundry, baby-tending—schools which would uplift the standard of girl-labour, and which would result in placing the children handicapped by their past in such a position in the labour market as practically to ensure their not again sinking.

If all children under the guardianship of the State were placed under the Education Department the money could be pooled, the institutions pooled, and the children placed under that method of education which was best suited to develop the physical condition, mental capacity, and individual aspirations of each individual child. Inasmuch as the Divine law has instituted families, and inasmuch as the greatest virtues grow unconsciously in the home, I would plead that each State-supported child be given the chance of being reared in somebody's home, there to find its way into somebody's heart. The economic value of love yet remains uncalculated excepting by the evidence of its absence.

If my readers have kindly gone thus far with me, and have accepted as a principle that the object of the State should be to prepare for or restore each individual dependent on it to Industrial Efficiency (while detaining those proven to be unfit), there will still lie before us the problem of the machinery for effecting this object.

All who think on these subjects are eagerly awaiting the recommendations of the Poor Law Commission, who in their wisdom will, it is hoped, not be content with just patching. Never was there a time when so much interest was taken in

social reform, or when there were so many men and women of good-will eager to spend themselves in the service of those who have fallen by the way. Never did charity do more harm, and never was officialism so jealous of volunteer assistance. The problem before reformers is how to control the charitable and use voluntary good-will to help the officials. "It takes a soul to raise a soul" is still true, and the secret of the success of religious bodies is that they fearlessly use the influence of individual character on individual character. Official organisations have an efficiency, a command of resources, and a persistency of effort which are rare in organisations that depend on voluntary gifts and voluntary service; but official organisations fail in their human aim in so far as they exclude the help of volunteers. Such volunteers are the best inspectors; they look at individuals for whom the organisations exist with eyes freshened by family affections and consciences awakened to national responsibilities; they see in the school, the hospital, the asylum, the casual ward much that had remained unintentionally, and often unconsciously, hidden. The public is the only live inspector, and the free mingling of volunteers with officials is the best way of introducing such inspectorate, and of preventing routine from becoming dead. The ideal force to obtain reforms is that the whole community should care, but it cannot care without knowing, and in order to know it must see from within. How to unite the abundant volunteer energy with the efficiency of the official for the welfare of the individual, is what those of us who know and care are awaiting with trembling, hopeful prayers to learn

from the coming report of the Poor Law Commission.*

* Perhaps it may not be practicable, but I would ask for the thoughts of the wise on the following suggestions :—

That all State-supported children, whether they now be under the Home Office or the Local Government Board, be placed under the Education Board, not to be lost in the mazes of the routine of a Department, already overburdened, but to be managed by a State Dependent Children's Council, with a salaried chairman, experienced officials, and representative volunteers, holding regular meetings, and wielding recognised powers. For Administrative purposes this Body controlled by the Education Department would, undoubtedly, use the Education Authorities already existent, who in their turn would, under statute, constitute State Dependent Children's Committees, consisting of stipulated proportions of their own elected members and co-opted volunteers, with a salaried chairman.

By some such method the State Dependent Children would gain the advantages of the union of officials and volunteers, their object being the welfare of the character of the individual child, for it cannot be too strongly or frequently emphasised that individual character is the only firm foundation of a nation's greatness.

1908.

PENSIONS AND MORALITY: AN ANTICIPATION

Morality, it is a commonplace to repeat, is the centre of national strength. Wealth will be increased in vain if at the same time truth and justice decrease in power. The New York Stock Exchange, according to "F. C. G.'s" cartoon, moved the Bishop aside to make way for the millionaires coming to its relief; but subsequent revelations have shown that the Bishop's precepts of moral dealing were more necessary than the millionaire's dollars. The final test, therefore, of all legislation is, "Will it increase morality in the nation?"

The determination to give pensions must be tried by this test.

A reference to personal experience may be of some use in approaching the question. When, thirty-five years ago, my wife and I went to live in Whitechapel we became conscious of the moral havoc caused by the prevailing system of out-relief and casual doles. The people told lies and practised deceit for the sake of getting help which proved to be no help. They spent time and effort in begging which might have been given to working. There was widely spread discontent, because the decision which often gave to one family what was refused to another was so

manifestly unjust. There was resentment because the workhouse, with its penal methods, punished poverty as if it were a crime.

A system which thus divided fellow-citizens into two bodies, one of which regarded the other as an antagonist whose money was fair spoil and whose injustice justified retaliation, was fatal to civic life and prejudicial to the growth of truth and justice. But if the system were stopped, what could be done for the old whose wages had never been sufficient to meet the day's needs and provide for times of age and weakness? Out-relief, so unsatisfactory as relief, had become necessary; it was, in fact, a deferred part of the wages earned by labour. It could not be stopped unless some substitute were provided.

The obvious substitute was a pension, and the Tower Hamlets Pension Fund was founded for three East London Unions in which the guardians had stopped out-relief. Men and women over sixty years of age, who had given evidence of character and thrift, were given a pension of 5s. a week. The experiment brought the committee into contact with a very aristocracy among the poor—people who had striven and worked and denied themselves in a vain effort to provide for old age. The pension took from them the dreaded ordeal of the relief office, where they would have been counted among the degraded applicants and been subject to the suspicious investigation of the relief officers. It removed also the fear of the workhouse and the loss of the self-respect so long their cherished possession. The pension gave them their homes and peace of mind. It added length to their days, and showed the committee that

it is anxiety which brings to many of the poor the sorrow and pain of death.

But difficulties soon arose in the administration of the fund. What was thrift? Was a man to be refused a pension because he had spent his savings in helping a friend or a child? Was a widow to be refused because her husband had been careless? Those and a hundred different questions puzzled the committee. A theory of what was called "constructive thrift" was established, but no satisfactory way could be found which appealed to the common-sense of justice. The evils which attended the giving of out-relief threatened to appear; applicants did not always tell the truth, and the right-doers did not feel secure that righteousness would be recognised. Investigation broke down, as, indeed, it must always break down when inquiry provokes a battle of wits, and when the standards of right differ in the various classes of society.

When, therefore, in 1883, I wrote "Practicable Socialism," I advocated universal pensions. The point I wish to make on this personal experience is that it was care for morality which produced this advocacy. Attempts to discriminate had weakened the sense of truth and justice; the only way seemed to be a proposal which would do away with all need for investigation, and open to every citizen an equal right to a pension. Universal pensions could provoke no deceit and establish no privileged class. They would be within the reach of every citizen and would be provided by their common contributions. They would secure to every one freedom from anxiety as to old age, and they would meet the claim for deferred wages which out-relief had

recognised without imperilling the moral sense of the community.

Two objections, however, are offered. One is that universal pensions would induce idleness and carelessness. The other is that the cost removes the proposal from the sphere of practical politics. As to the first, opinions are not arguments; but opinions based on much experience have their value. My opinion is that this certainty of a pension will promote thrift. It is the hopeless who are thriftless. The possession of a nest-egg induces addition, and the man who belongs to one club aims to join another. People are not so much frightened as drawn into thrifty habits; perhaps it is true to say people are rarely frightened into any persistent action.

As to the second objection, only experts can say what taxation is possible; but the man in the street must see that a tax to pay universal pensions is unlike other taxes. It is returned to the pockets of the taxpayer; it is, indeed, national insurance rather than taxation. Every citizen who through his life has directly or indirectly contributed to the national funds will, at the age (say) of sixty-five, begin to receive back what he has paid.

The proposal for universal pensions is not, I would submit, so impracticable as it seems, but the Government has now put it beyond discussion. An Act of Parliament recognises the principle that the old are to have pensions not as of favour but as of right. Work for the country is henceforth to be treated as honourably as fighting for the country, and every citizen has in the establishment of pensions an outward and visible sign that his

country recognises his service. The sense of national obligation will thus be strengthened, and this is a moral sense.

Further, old age will be relieved of anxiety and of fear. The old will be more able to live out all their days and teach those lessons of calm and of reverence which make more for morality than is always remembered.

Mr. Asquith in his speeches has shown that he understands how the necessity of judging between the deserving and the undeserving has made Poor Law relief unequal and degrading. We may believe, therefore, that provisions which exclude those who have "habitually refused to work" or "habitually refrained from working when physically able to do so," or "been brought into a position to apply for a pension by a wilful act or misbehaviour," must ultimately be amended. There is no safe test except a mechanical one, such as freedom from lunacy or crime. This every one can understand and apply, but to judge of another's "misbehaviour" there would have to be the intrusive inquiry which destroys modesty and provokes resentment.

Parliament must, it may be believed, amend this provision; the question arises whether some change can be made as to the requirement which excludes every one possessing an income of ten shillings a week. Parents will be tempted to make pretences of transferring their property to their children; owners will hide their possessions; dodges will be invented to keep incomes below the ten-shilling limit; expert officials will pursue their inquiries and rouse the wit of defence to meet the wit of attack; suspicion will be encouraged, and

there will be cases of manifest injustice, when some one is excluded from a pension because he has been less wasteful of opportunities than his neighbour who has become eligible through his carelessness. The requirement must, it would seem, introduce practices and feelings which are not moral.

The Pension Act tried, then, by the test, "Will it increase morality in the nation?" can hardly pass so long as the ten-shilling limit exists. An alternative is difficult to suggest. Universal pensions, on account of their cost, are ruled to be outside practical politics; and therefore some limit must be found. Such a limit might have been found in the restriction of pensions to women till the machinery was perfected and the extent of the demand estimated. There is manifest justice in giving priority to women, on whom falls most heavily the burden of old age. Women's work, which, as mothers and as housekeepers, is often harder than man's, is not paid for by any wages out of which savings could be laid up. Such a proposal is, however, now among the "might-have-beens." It remains only to suggest whether a sufficient limit would not be found if every one above the pension age were required to register himself or herself in the district of their fixed abode, and make personal application week by week for payment. This requirement would not of necessity exclude any class of person, but it would, as a matter of fact, exclude (1) the vagrants and those who have not established a settled home, and (2) all whose means allowed them the luxury of frequent absences. Authority for certain absences and for times of

sickness might, of course, be given, but personal application week by week should be the rule.

The question is not yet settled. My plea is that no answer be accepted which promises a new crop of deceit, a sense of further injustice, and a renewed suspicion of nation good-will. The model Governor is one who saves the people from "falsehood and wrong."

The moment long expected has come. It would be a grievous pity if the first grant of pensions were followed by abiding disappointment. Disappointment there must be, but disappointment at an age or a sex limit is not without hope. The disappointment which is kept alive by repeated instances of neighbours' deceitfulness and by examples of injustice on the part of those in authority is a disappointment which abides and at last loosens the bonds of national life.

PS.—The ten-shilling limit has been, as every one knows, adopted with some modifications, and on all sides difficult cases are being pushed to the front. Statements constructively true but not in accordance with fact have to be accepted, and manipulations of income are going on so that applicants may no longer appear to be receiving ten shillings a week. It may be that things will adjust themselves; but so far the "anticipation" seems to be justified, and the great boon of pensions is not increasing truth and good-will.

PART III

EDUCATION

HOOLIGANISM

Mansion House Funds for the Relief of Distress used to be a terror to many East Londoners. The relief was often so much more harmful than the distress. Advertisement gave a sort of distinction to squalor, a premium was put upon dirt, and the self-respect of the poor was weakened. The hastily-given relief drove in the symptoms without touching the cause of the disease, and often did entirely the wrong thing. The fund was thus followed by a crop of ill-will, and in some cases by increased poverty. The last Mansion House Fund so obviously failed that another will not lightly be proposed.

The present attitude of the public towards ruffianism suggests a parallel danger. There is the same hurry to do away with the evil by one great sweep. There is the same advertisement which gives distinction to wrong, and "blackguard" is used as a pet name for a "club." There is the same anxiety to get rid of symptoms, to secure quiet anyhow whether it be by bribery or by force; and there is the same impatience of searching into causes and facing facts. There is the same danger lest the

wrong thing may be done, and a crop of greater evil be sown to trouble another generation.

In the days of the Mansion House Funds those men and women who protested against their action never denied the distress. Their contention was that the cause was chronic in certain classes of the population, and that the only safe course of procedure was to strengthen the agencies which were persistently attacking those causes.

In these days, rich in proposals for "dealing with Hooliganism," there is no ground for denying the ruffianism. There are gangs of noisy boys and girls, there are street-fights, and there are ruffianly acts. But there has been no time within my experience when like things were not going on. The popularity of soldiering and the tales of the war may have given a new direction to the spirit of the boys. The leniency of popular sentiment—the easy carelessness which grows up in a time of great self-indulgence—the emancipation of women of all classes from many old conventions,—public opinion affecting (as it always does affect) police action, may have encouraged ruffians to come more into the open thoroughfares and to be more daring in their deeds.

But the boys—as boys of other classes—have always had in them the fighting spirit, and the loafers have always behaved as ruffians. A police superintendent who in my early East London days told me how many officers are cruelly and often permanently injured in efforts to keep order in low neighbourhoods stamped this fact on my mind. There is in London a ruffianly population—small indeed in proportion to the whole, but in number

large enough to be both a nuisance and a danger. The boy armies are not made up of ruffians and may be left to pass away as a phase of the times. The streets are not convenient as playing-fields, the game may not be the best in which to show their sport, but there are for the poor few convenient open spaces, and if the boys are treated with good temper and discretion they will probably do little damage to themselves or any one.

The ruffians raise a much more serious difficulty. They are older in years and there is design in their ruffianism. How are they produced? Where are they to be found? How do they live? are questions which must be answered before any effective action can be taken.

They arise in certain localities—not in quiet and long-settled neighbourhoods such as is the greater part of East London, but in the haunts of vagrants, along the river-side with its changing population, and in places where, on account of darkness and overcrowding, order is disregarded. They have probably never acknowledged any authority either of parent or teacher, and they have passed from club to club, taking from the passage not good but ill. They get a living by casual jobs, by crime, or by the profits of vice.

What is to be done by way of prevention and of cure? The obviously wrong thing is to identify noisy and even "naughty" boys with such a class and to adopt a name such as "Hooliganism" to cover crime. "Fools," we are told, "make a mock at sin," and the folly of making ruffianism and blackguardism a matter of interest will become manifest in a national loss of moral force. Ruffianism

is crime, and should be treated as crime—with consideration, of course, but also with indignation.

The growth of such a class as has been described is, however, a reproach to the city, and although it may not be wise to give that class the distinction of special treatment, it is necessary for citizens to consider how its appearance may be prevented.

I would suggest as practicable the following reforms:—

I. Better order in the streets of poor neighbourhoods. The poorer the population the better should be the lighting and the cleaner the streets. It is unreasonable that in the same city, where the citizens are members one of another, St. George's-in-the-West should be light and clean and St. George's-in-the-East dark and dirty. If there are dark corners, if noise and fighting are permitted, if stalls are allowed to encumber the roadways and litter them with refuse, there will be a constant drag on efforts at self-respect. Decent surroundings often induce decent habits. The permitted disorder of the streets is, as experienced officers repeatedly testify, the greatest obstacle to general improvement.

II. Uninhabitable and overcrowded houses should be impossible. Boys and girls in such houses break loose from authority, and their departure from home is often a welcome release. Want of air and room in the home is probably the chief cause of vice. The cure may be difficult, but it is not beyond the reach of money and brains if they be moved by good-will.

III. Compulsory continuation schools. Children now leave school just as it becomes interesting. If

it were the law that no employer could employ a young person under sixteen who did not every week present a certificate of attendance at two or three classes the children would find in the pleasant schools congenial occupation. They would all have to go, and having to go would develop tastes which would save them from temptation. If it be said that the children who become ruffians never go to school and never go to employers, the answer is that other reforms will gradually reduce the number of such children, and that the example of the class above is very effective on the class below.

IV. A rigorous enforcement of the Act which removes children from the guardianship of vagrants and other unsatisfactory characters. The School Authority and the guardians might co-operate for this end, and the obstacle raised by those who object to the expense being thrown on the rate-payers of one locality might easily be removed.

V. A more careful training of the imagination in all schools, high and elementary. Much of the evil of the time may be traced to outraged imagination. It is the strongest quality of the brain, and it is starved. Children from their earliest years are hedged in with facts, they are not trained to use their minds on the unseen, to practise their thoughts on the abstract. "England," Lord Goschen said many years ago, "lost America for want of imagination." Englishmen now take to drink—to wild courses and wild remedies—for want also of imagination. It may seem unpractical in days of technical education to put in such a claim, but it is to be remembered that the Scots, who studied metaphysics, have not proved the least successful

in the work of the world. If they had more imagination the poor would be happier and steadier, and the rich, in their dealings with the poor, would be wiser and more helpful.

VI. Further personal intercourse. Clubs, and especially boys' clubs, afford an admirable means for such intercourse. Clubs are valuable indeed just in so far as they enable men of higher education and higher aims to come into contact with less fortunate boys. A mere building, though it be fitted with everything which is attractive, is in itself of little value, and is in the opinion of many qualified to judge, a mere temptation to selfishness, idling ways, and empty talk. But a club, though it be small in size, though it have no better place of meeting than a school-room, and though its equipments be all makeshifts, may, if it be inspired by a few clean, manly, and, if possible, thoughtful leaders, safely convoy many lads through the first and more perilous temptations of life. Money may be necessary for the expenses of such clubs, and a useful fund might be formed from which to make money grants. A few rules would have to be made as a guide in making such grants to old or new clubs, and the chief rule, I would submit, should be the presence in the club of a sufficient number of men qualified to guide and recreate the boys.

These and such reforms might do something to prevent the growth of ruffianism, drunkenness, gambling, and vice amid modern Christian civilisation. But when everything is done nothing will avail but a new spirit in all classes of society, among the rich as among the poor. The few ruffians would be no danger if they did not form a

centre, drawing to themselves easy and careless characters—young workmen discontented at some misunderstanding, elated by winning some bet, excited by drink.

The causes of ruffianism might be removed, but unless there is everywhere a less arrogant and a humbler spirit—a passion of humanity made patient by the fear of God—a puritanism made wider by knowledge—there will be little lasting improvement. The work of reform is not done by changing the habits of the masses, but by changing also the habits of the classes.

1900.

SPECIAL COURTS OF JUSTICE FOR CHILDREN

How curious is the phenomenon when it can be said that "there is a reform in the air"! A sort of microbe seems to start simultaneously the same movement in the minds of various people, often without previous communication or contact. The demand made for the establishment of special courts of justice for children is an example. The State Children's Association, the Wage-earning Children's Committee, the Howard Association, the Humanitarian League, the Waifs and Strays Society, and the Metropolitan Asylums Board are each severally and by various methods pressing for this reform. In reply to a circular letter on the subject issued by the State Children's Association, and sent to clerks of education committees and their officers, and also to those who have made a scientific study of the problems surrounding child-life in our great cities, Dr. Barnardo speaks of the "wisdom and extreme common-sense of the arrangements of the Children's Courts in Boston, U.S.A." Mr. Thomas Ackroyd, hon. secretary of the Boys' and Girls' Refuges and Homes in Manchester, advocates the need of separate courts of justice for children, "instead of bringing them into the demoralising

atmosphere of the ordinary police-court"; the secretary of the Reformatory and Refuge Union states "that the Union considers that separate courts of justice for children would be a great advantage in every way, and that they have urged the matter on the Home Office"; the Rev. B. Waugh, late director of the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, says that he has "again and again urged the need for the adoption of a new court for children"—a consensus of experienced opinion which is gathered up in the report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration (issued July, 1904), in which occur these words:—

"In all cases touching the young where the assistance of a magistrate is invoked, he should, where possible, be a specially selected person sitting for the purpose."

Before, however, we consider reforms, it is well to be quite clear about existing conditions, and, in the hope that those of my readers who know all about the subject will pardon me, I propose, as the children say, to "begin at the very beginning."

First, then, in London, there are twenty-two police-courts, and in one year the figures of which are at hand 668 children were brought under arrest to these courts, besides the far larger number who were brought there under other conditions. On being arrested these children are taken to the police-station, often placed in the cells for the night, and then brought up to the police-court to be tried. In most cases, those charged with such offences as would involve their being committed to industrial schools are remanded to one of the three

Remand Homes established by the Metropolitan Asylums Board, there to remain, sometimes for several weeks, making regular appearances in the police-courts until vacancies have been found in industrial schools, to which they are then committed until they have reached the age of sixteen years.

Now the drawbacks to this method of procedure are manifold, and they may be classed under the following heads :—

I. The committal of child-offenders on arrest to the police cells (where, if placed with other offenders, they must inevitably see and hear much that is unfit for them), and the detention of them there until their trial.

II. The trial of children in the ordinary police-court, where they are placed in the dock as criminals (though they may only be charged with being destitute, with having played mischievously in the street, with trespassing, or with offences under the Education or Employment of Children Acts).

III. The presence of children in the courts during the hearing of other charges, many of them of a sad and often defiling nature.

Concerning the drawbacks under the first head, some of the facts are well given by that children's champion, Miss Nettie Adler. She says :—

" Every child who is arrested by a police or by an industrial schools officer must, in the first instance, be taken to a police-station to be charged. If it is early in the day, he is then brought before a magistrate and formally committed to the Remand Home. If, however, the child is charged after four o'clock in the afternoon, he must remain all night

at the police-station, and if he is so unfortunate as to be arrested on a Saturday, he will be compelled to pass both Saturday and Sunday nights in a police-station cell. Occasionally such children are guarded in the waiting-room. In some few instances a sympathetic inspector will bring the forlorn little soul upstairs to his own quarters. But it will be realised how seldom this can be done with due safety to the kind-hearted official's own household, when we remember that often on admission to the Remand Home the child's clothing has to be burnt forthwith. Frequently, therefore, small boys and girls have to spend a night in the cold, gloom, and loneliness of a police-cell, perhaps with very inadequate covering."

It has often been said to me: "Surely, Mrs. Barnett, a child used to the Whitechapel streets and common lodging-houses will not be injured by a night in the cells, or contaminated by an hour or two in the police-courts." Now, even if the children brought to the police-courts were all of the degraded class, that is no justification for further officially sanctioned degradation. But many of the children who appear are not members of the criminal classes of society. As the law now stands, there is no place other than the police-courts where children have to apply if their birth certificates are required, or if they desire a theatrical licence; while all children found wandering, or destitute, or without a fixed home, or consorting with bad characters, have to be brought there for protection or correction. That there is a large number of such cases is shown by the following figures: Of 417 children who passed through

the Pentonville Remand Home during the first four months of one year, 187 had been taken before the Bench merely because they were found to be destitute, or were discovered to be living with degraded associates. At the Camberwell Remand Home the proportion was about the same; 92 out of 224 children had been placed in the home through no fault of their own. In 1902 the three homes of the Metropolitan Asylums Board received 1,786 boys and 235 girls, and the causes of their arrest were as follows :—

In 621 cases, felony (various forms of theft for the most part).

In 165 cases, larceny.

In 274 cases, begging.

In 504 cases, wandering, or without visible means.

In 154 cases, beyond control, or not under control of parents.

In 73 cases, living in houses of ill-fame.

In 11 cases, sleeping out.

Of these 503 were discharged, 46 birched, 81 fined or "bound over," 45 were handed over to the police-court missionary, and 819 were sent to reformatory or industrial schools, while the ultimate disposal of 440 was entered as "unknown."

With regard to the evils under the second and third heads, Mr. Lowrey says, in his article on "The Criminal Boy" in the volume written for the Toynbee Trust:—

"A serious matter is the defenceless position of the boy when he is on his trial. He may be guilty or he may not. It is certain that appearances are against him, or he would not have been arrested. In any case it lies with him to prove his innocence.

How is he to do it? He is young, probably ill-educated, and inexperienced. It is impossible for him to present his case properly. The odds are enormously in favour of his being guilty, but the point is that he has not a fair chance of defending himself."

Another writer, in the *Guardian*, describes the facts thus:—

"Occasionally the children are guarded in the gaoler's room or the waiting-room. More often they are seated in the court itself until their cases are heard; and, although efforts are made, more especially in the metropolitan area, to deal with these as early in the day as possible, they are yet often detained until after the night charges are taken, until two or three o'clock in the afternoon, and may be present while the details of some of those cases of drunkenness and brutality are heard which are such a blot on our civilisation. It must be remembered, too, that the same treatment is meted out to little ones of seven and eight years old as is bestowed on the depraved and sodden in crime. They all stand in the prisoner's dock. The figure of a mite of seven, whose little face scarcely reached the iron bar, will always haunt the writer: his only crime was absolute destitution. He had been found wandering, he had no parents, and his married sister had turned him out of her house. And there he stood—pale, frightened, scarcely understanding what went on around him. One could only hope that the sheltering walls of the industrial school might make some reparation for the past, though one wished that he was going to some kindly woman's home rather than to an institution."

To render these evils a matter of history only, the most needed reform is now the establishment, in London and in all large provincial towns, of courts especially set apart for children's cases. It is noteworthy that in this matter we can go forward fearlessly, for our own colonies, as well as America, have shown us what to aim for and what to avoid.

In Australia, children's courts were established many years ago—1890. In Canada, an Act of 1894 provided for almost all we now ask, and in Toronto there is a special court for the hearing of all juvenile applicants. In America, Massachusetts, which has so often led the way in wise action with regard to educational matters, established children's courts as far back as 1863; and a short time ago I received from my old young friend, Mr. A. Edmund Spender, a long letter describing how he had been impressed with the system when, as a member of the Moseley Commission, he had been called to investigate it. In New Zealand and New South Wales legislation is pending to establish these courts; but England, with her vast population, her numerous waif-children, her wealth, and her continuous talk on education, has as yet done nothing —nothing, I should say, as a whole, though Dublin, Bury, Bolton, Manchester, Birmingham, and Bradford have either taken, or are about to take, steps so that in future all "children's cases shall be heard in places separate and apart from adults."

So far, I am sure, I have carried with me the sympathy of my readers. It is almost self-evident that children should not be contaminated by knowledge of evil. It seems to need no arguing that those who have to come in contact with the law—

themselves being law-abiding—should not suffer the pains or injury of association with the degraded. But this is not all. The reform which would prevent such evils, important as it is, seems almost trivial in comparison with the still greater and more far-reaching reform which would almost necessarily follow the establishment of special courts of justice for children, and "the appointment of a magistrate, who should be a specially selected person, sitting for the purpose."

Again, however, before we consider reforms, it is well that we should clearly understand the present conditions. There are in England and Wales 139 industrial schools, accommodating 13,930 boys and 4,656 girls. These industrial schools are, be it noted, under, not the Education Department, but the Home Office, which has the control of prisons, inebriate homes, and reformatories. They are, in short, prison-schools, entered only through the police-courts, by sentence of the magistrate, the term of confinement ending with the legal termination of childhood—*i.e.*, sixteen years. Those little chaps of seven or eight, the small maids of nine and ten, with their wistful faces and eyes full of love-hunger or world-defiance—where must they be sent? Not, as all of us who care for little children would like to believe, to some "kindly woman's home," but to an institution based on the foundation thought of discipline and restraint, that being what some educationalists considered is required for naughty, lawless lads of fourteen and fifteen, but not for poor bairns of seven, whose only crime is orphanage, whose sole sin it is to be "utterly destitute." To subject these mites to repressive

discipline for seven, eight, or nine years is to wrong them. They want kissing at that age, not drilling; petticoats, not labour masters.

There is another evil attached to the present system, as to which I will quote Miss Isabella Baker, one of the veteran public workers of London, herself a guardian, and also a member of the Metropolitan Asylums Board:—

"Children [she says] are brought again and again into court, for the magistrates cannot remand them for a longer period than a week, and they come back to the Remand Homes with their little brains stuffed full of the horrible and nauseous things they have heard in court."

The pith of that sentence is that the children appear "again and again" in the court, remanded week after week, and the reason is because they are waiting until the busy court officer can find a vacancy in one of the 139 industrial schools, and a place for these unwanted waifs among the other 18,586 children already treated as semi-criminal.

Now, with the best will in the world (and the kindness and humanity of some of the officials is beyond human praise), it is not possible for each of the twenty-two metropolitan stipendiary magistrates so to keep in touch with these 139 institutions as to know which is the best suited for the character, the age, fault, disposition, health of the small culprit before him. He can but remand him or her until there is time for inquiry. If in London, or in towns large enough to require it, special courts were established solely for children's cases, the magistrate, the clerk, the officers would make children's interests their chief consideration, and set

themselves to ascertain the educational methods and the especial treatment most likely to cherish the smoking flax of good which is to be found in the most depraved of young humans.

The results obtained by such a change may be classed under four heads :—

I. The confidence of charitable agencies.

II. Knowledge of existing institutions.

III. Uniformity of action, which the poor could understand.

IV. Experience of the success or failure of different educational methods.

I.

The Confidence of Charitable Agencies dealing with Children.

What a number of children I should have taken to the courts in my thirty-three years of Whitechapel life had I been able to have trust in the magistrate's knowledge and experience!

I can recall Sydney Cowan, aged eleven, the eldest of four children. His father, a drear man, always out of work, not so much from idleness as from discontent—this work unworthy of his powers, that employer indifferent to his potentialities—jealous of others' success, he was always on the look-out for "something suitable," meanwhile taking his "full share of his victuals and drink," partly to ensure his being fit when the desired job did present itself, partly to vindicate his right to his wife, and all she was and had, including her earnings, for she it was who supported herself, him, the home, the four children by slaving at the laundry.

Sydney was a curious lad. Mentally bright, he was morally dull; physically industrious, he was intellectually idle; calculatingly selfish, he was yet capable of chivalrous affection. But, his parents away all day, mischief presented itself as attractive, and during the many hours that were not school hours he introduced himself and the three younger ones to bad companions and worse ways. "The officer had better have him," said the father; and the officer finally got him, and for five years the country supported that lad, to the relief of his ne'er-do-well father, to the raising of the rates, and to the injury of the neighbours' spirit of independence.

Polly Leary's mother was a widow, young, nearly blind, and had begging in her bones. Polly was six when I first had the privilege of her acquaintance, with the bewitching blue eyes and black hair of our sister-islanders, well-grown, coy, mischievous, curious, affectionate, self-willed, energetic, greedy—a little bit of human nature that required delicate handling to produce any good, and yet capable of noble activities.

One of the practices of the St. Jude's parish committee was to organise not only relief but efforts, and so employment was found for Mrs. Leary, which, with a weekly grant, would have enabled her to keep a one-roomed home for Polly and herself. But she would not do it, preferring begging under the name of gutter-tray hawking, and when she picked up the acquaintances of people who "kindly offered to treat her" she drifted downwards. She did not live a declaredly immoral life, and with the aid of a worthy north-country brother,

who saw only her misfortunes, and those through magnifying glasses, she was enabled to keep her room. But she was a bad mother to Polly. If ever a child needed the discipline of an industrial school she did, but "discharged" was the verdict of the magistrate, whose manifold duties did not allow him to give time to so complicated a tangle of humanity and town civilisation. The end of Polly is what I do not care to write. "End" have I said, but that is not true; the end of her life, even in this world, is not yet, and the marvellous, unflagging patience of Mother Emma and her sisterhood, the controlling influences of work under discipline, the stimulating effect of motherhood (although unhallowed), and the atmosphere of living piety with which she is surrounded may yet work a miracle. But the pity of it!

> "Oh, the little more, and how much it is!
> And the little less, and what worlds away!"

Polly might have been saved from committing and causing sin, and Sydney should have had a sharp, short sentence to a punishment school, and should have been released under the probation officer, whose legal position would have given him just that power with the parents which would have shaken some of the self-complacency out of the father, and done something to sustain the mother's rule over the other children. No one is to blame. The magistrate, the officer, the missionary—all do their best possible. It is the system which is wrong, alike to those who work it, those who suffer from it, and those who pay for it.

II.

Knowledge of Existing Institutions.

The 139 industrial schools differ greatly. They may be large or small. Some depend on strict government, others on wise guidance. Some carry discipline almost to hardship; others depend on awakening in children, by interest in handicraft or trade learning, a desire to reform and do well. In some the training and management are best suited to younger children; in others, to elder lads or girls. Some are controlled by committees of alert and intelligent managers; others are under the care of moribund, indolent, or self-satisfied boards of management, who are content to leave all trouble and responsibility to the officers. In some schools child labour is used for the benefit of the trades which are carried on for the maintenance of the institution, a system which allows grave evils to exist; in others, the work of the children is mainly educational. Some are, in towns, so closely surrounded by buildings as to be playgroundless, and others are well placed in open country. It is necessary that the magistrate should know all the facts about every school, its situation, characteristics, management, changes of staff, developments, and last, but not least, its vacancies, so that each child would at once be consigned to the institution best suited to its age, antecedents, health, nature, or fault. Thus time and money in conveyance would be saved, and the children would not have to come back "again and again," to the court-house to their own injury and to the cost of the exchequer.

III.

Uniformity of Action, which the Poor could Understand.

The poor are scholars in Nature's school; they know the invariableness of her law and are patient under punishment. Variable laws seem to them to be unjust, and give them false guidance. The ways of magistrates are variable; one dismisses, one inflicts fines, another imprisons. In the provinces, in 1902–3, 1,034 boys and 29 girls were convicted, and more than half of these were committed to prison in default of payment of a fine. One boy, under sixteen, had been to prison thirty times, and had had forty-one convictions. Sometimes the magistrates discharge the cases so frequently as to discourage children being brought before them. Sometimes they commit most of the juveniles brought before them to industrial schools, a wholesale dealing with retail cases which is unworthy of the human justice which implies intelligence and sympathy.

IV.

Experience of the Success or Failure of Different Educational Methods.

Humanity is so complex, especially child humanity, that only experience can tell what will succeed or fail. The magistrates and officers of a special court would gain this experience, and would be able to direct changes in the class of provision for such children. Their knowledge would help the in-

spectors of the Home Office, and without claiming the gift of prophecy, it is, I think, safe to say that one of the first reforms that would be advocated would be the provision of probation officers. That system has been variously defined and described. One American writer speaks of it as a "system of enlisting the child's interest in his own reform." Miss Hughes, whose pamphlet* on it is most interesting, says: "The probation system may be briefly described as an attempt to reform a prisoner outside prison." In the Wage-earning Children's Committee's memorandum it is described thus:—

"Under this system youthful delinquents are allowed by the justices of the Children's Courts to return to their parents on probation, while probation officers, usually women, are appointed by the Court to watch over the children, to visit them at their homes, and to report on their progress and conduct from time to time. If the delinquents are beyond school age, employment is found for them and means are taken to interest employers in their welfare. In all but a very small proportion of cases this action obviates the need for committal to industrial and reformatory schools."

Of the success of the work of the probation officers there can be little doubt, and it is generally acknowledged that it is their labours which have so reduced the number of child prisoners in the United States. For instance, previous to the enactment of the Juvenile Court law in Chicago, about 600 children out of the 1,300 charged with offences were committed every year to the county gaol, besides those

* Published by the Howard Association.

who were confined from time to time in police cells and stations. Since the appointment of the probation officers, however, of about 1,300 children actually brought before that court per annum, *under twelve each year* are now committed to gaol.

In Philadelphia the figures are even more remarkable :—

OFFICIAL REPORT FROM COURT RECORDS, JUNE 14, 1901, TO NOVEMBER 1, 1902.

Delinquents	1,112
Returned home on probation	1,008
Charged again, twice	24
Charged again, three times...	3
Sent to houses of refuge	104

The advantages to the children of thus enabling them by good conduct to earn their right to freedom are self-evident, if also subtle, but the advantages to the State and to the ratepayer must not be overlooked. I have known bad parents deliberately tempt their children to steal their own money, and then send for the officer, have them arrested, and themselves give evidence against them, congratulating themselves to their intimates that they have got relieved of their offspring and their responsibilities to them. The cost to the ratepayer of supporting some 18,000 children, at certainly not less than £20 a year for each child, is easily reckoned, an expenditure no child-lover or patriot would object to if it were the best for the child or the country. But is it? Does not experience prove that the establishment of probation officers is "the more excellent way"?

That the probation officers should be persons not

only of high character, but of special knowledge of and care for child nature, is essential. Mrs. Schoff, the President of the United States Congress of Mothers, thus describes what is needed :—

"Child study, psychology, as related to the characteristics and development of various stages of childhood, a study of penology and sociology, and such legal training as is required for the presentation of cases, combined with common-sense and a consecrated love for the children, are requisites for good probation work. The entire time of the officer, and individual care and thought for each child, are essential to satisfactory probation work. An officer, therefore, must not have too many cases under his or her care. Our officers are women. Dealing as they do with the child and the mother, they come, we hold, into closer relations than can a man, for child care is ever women's work, the mother's work which the world needs."

Hastily must we return from America to consider our own country and its needs. Sir Howard Vincent introduced a Bill into Parliament, backed by Mr. Samuel Smith, Sir John Gorst, and Mr. Tennant, the object of which was the establishment of children's courts of justice. As it stood it would not have accomplished much, but it might have been amended, or rather developed, in committee, and if it had succeeded in legally securing and providing payment for arrangements by which children's cases could be heard apart from those of adults, and if it had enabled the thought of the magistrates to be more focussed on the young and their educational needs, it could reasonably have been expected that the appointment of probation officers would have

ultimately followed. Perhaps in the beginning charity-money will have to pay for such officers, but as their work proves their value it will surely be borne home, even to unthinking people, that it is cheaper to pay one woman £150 a year to reform, by personal care, eighty children, than it is to support those eighty children in institutions at the rate of £1,600 a year.

"It is," writes Judge Lindsey, of Denver, "the purpose of our law to protect children from being stigmatised with conviction as criminals, and by letter and spirit to constantly encourage them to personal work and effort."

"An experience of thousands of children [says another American expert on this subject] has proved conclusively that there is no *criminal* class of children. A child's environment, lack of home care, and neglect may lead him into any crime, but in each we find the germ of good, and to quicken and develop it is our work. Punishment does not accomplish this. Education, help, love, and patient stimulation of the better instincts can alone develop the germ. We do not consider the crime, we consider the child, and we have saved those whom even the reform schools feared to take, considering them prodigies of crime. We also encourage parental responsibility, and provide help and instruction for ignorant, careless parents."

With this testimony of experience, now extending over many years, are we in England still to linger behind, and go on treating as criminals the children in whom is the hope of the nation? 1905.

PS.—The Children's Bill, which has just passed the House of Commons, among many other good provisions establishes special courts and probation officers. 1908.

AN *AD HOC* OR A GENERAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY

THE proposal for a direct election of an education authority has attractions for the politician and for the educationist. The politician knows that the people like the appearance of trust in themselves, the educationist hopes that the call to vote for a special education authority may also be a call to take interest in education questions.

But the objections may be summarised.

I. *Sectarian strife may be introduced into secondary schools.*—The authority of the future is to be responsible for all education, so that the friction which comes of competition and the waste which comes of overlapping may cease. Candidates for membership of this authority must, however, go to the electors with a "cry," and there is no very obvious "cry" suggested in educational policy. Once let it be settled that education shall be generously or sparingly provided—which is a question fairly dividing the Progressive from the Moderate mind—most of the other questions are matters of administration with which electors cannot deal. Electors must, however, have a "cry"—something which can be put into a few words and something which rouses passion. The traditions of School

Board elections make it more than probable that the "cry" would be about the religious question. The electors would thus lose sight of what is really important as they support or obstruct rival religious sects; and, worst of all, secondary education, which has hitherto developed unshadowed by religious controversy, would be brought within reach of the same malign influence.

II. *Private interests are likely to dominate public interests.*—A body elected for some special object affords easy opportunities for sections of the community with their own interests or with "fads" to get themselves elected. The subjects before the electorate are not sufficiently various to keep any one subject in its proper relation, the view is not sufficiently wide to show the real value of a "fad." If, for instance, the Navy or the Post Office were managed by an *ad hoc* Board it is fairly obvious that the interests of the workers would overshadow those of the public, and that the "fads" of enthusiasts about tube boilers or the Sunday delivery of letters would get undue consideration. An education authority elected *ad hoc* would most likely be under the control of the teachers it employs, and give much too large space for the operation of faddists.

An *ad hoc* body cannot be as representative as a body generally elected. It does not represent opinion in its proper proportions. In the County Council election, for instance, one interest is kept in check by many other interests, and it would not be possible for the interests of the denominations to take the place they have taken in School Board elections.

III. *Education may become unpopular.*—Rating authorities who themselves are lavish of expenditure resent the precept which calls on them to levy rates to be spent by another authority. They do not know what they are paying for; they imagine waste, and when, as in educational work, much faith is required, they are likely to denounce the education as unnecessary, and, throwing on the education authority the blame for high rates, make education unpopular. The spending departments of the municipality, as of a well-managed business, ought to be under one control, so that each may have proportionate consideration.

IV. *The authority may lose some of its independence.*—Local government, with its responsibilities, is for the moment the hope of the nation. The multiplication of authorities in one area means weakness. The electorate grows weary of elections, the supply of good candidates is not sufficient, the various authorities waste strength in jealousies, and sometimes spend the public money in litigation as to which authority has the right to serve the public. The weakness of the local authority makes necessary the interference of the central office, which gradually limits its independence. A board of guardians cannot appoint a charwoman without the leave of the Local Government Board. If the people are ready to govern themselves it must be through an authority strong enough to resist bureaucratic government—the local authority, that is to say, must be one representing the whole strength of the locality.

V. *An* ad hoc *body tends to become an administering rather than a directing body.*—There is not

enough of "direction" to occupy the energy or thought of the members, there are not sufficient subjects for their consideration; so they themselves take to doing what officials could do better under their direction. The administration is therefore often vacillating, and there is no room on the staff for a strong administrator. The authority is expensive without being efficient. One weakness of the London School Board was that it kept so much management in the hands of its members that it did not develop popular interest in schools by interesting the neighbours as responsible managers.

Many minds are still considering what is the best education authority for London. There are some to whom the chief consideration is party advantage, and they weigh in the balances the possible profit or loss to the side of Moderate or Progressive, Church or Chapel, Property or Labour. There are others whose one thought is to secure the best education for every child and a popular interest in education. The County Council, which is directly elected, which, through its Progressive and Moderate members, represents the opinion of London—which by its strength is able to carry out its own policy—seems to be the body best fitted to be responsible for a complete system of education.

But some one will say, "How can County Councils do well the duties of an educational authority as well as those which they must do?" "How is it likely that they can admit a freer development of varieties of education than was admitted by the School Boards?" "How can the country be saved from a narrow type of teaching imposed by a central authority?"

The answer is, "By delegation." Mr. Forster's Act gave power to a School Board to delegate its authority to managers. The clause was so wide that it has been said that a Board might have met once, appointed managers, and not met again except to receive reports and to pay the cheques. The saying is, of course, an exaggeration, but Mr. Forster's hope evidently was that by the use of managers the interest in education would rest on a larger base, and more room be given for varieties of schools subject to the breath of local opinion.

It was no new departure to entrust schools to managers. Church schools, British schools, and industrial schools have been and are still under bodies of men and women who look after the buildings, appoint the teachers, befriend the children, perform the duties of correspondents, and administer public money. These bodies may have their own faults, but they do secure an interest which lightens the drudgery of making returns, attending committees, and inspecting registers, and also brings into the schools a something which often stirs teachers and children to greater individual life.

School Boards, however, did not care to follow this lead or to delegate much authority. The members elected for a special object felt themselves responsible for all the details of management and expenditure. They kept within their own control not only the decision to build schools and enforce the compulsory clauses, not only the general principles and the scope of the education they offered; they also kept themselves responsible for mending broken windows and dealing with the difficulties of individual pupil-teachers.

If, as in London, managers were appointed, their powers were so limited or their activities so snubbed that men and women of character found it hard to serve.

The Board School system thus tended year by year to become more stiff, more uniform, and more official, not so much by the fault of the members as by the necessity of their position. The men and women elected to look after the schools of the community felt themselves bound to do what they were sent to do, and they appointed officials to be their eyes or their hands; they as their work extended had to trust more and more to the reports of these officials, and on the reports to make "rules and regulations"; they, because they took too much on themselves or because they were not always equipped by previous thought or experience, fell into a groove made by one or two members better equipped than themselves, and they were naturally zealous for the privileges and dignity of their own body. Their duty made them narrow and their virtue made them obstructive.

The constitution of School Boards thus prevented that widening of policy and that reception of the lessons of change which Mr. Forster hoped to secure by delegation.

The constitution of County Councils is, on the other hand, such as to encourage delegation. The members have already great responsibilities for the health and order of the community, and their responsibilities are likely to grow until they include the control of monopolies, the administration of the Poor Law, and the ordering of the drink traffic. They can feel bound neither by anxiety for the dignity

of their body nor by their obligations to constituents nor by the need of work to keep in their own hands the details of the management of education. They can be content to settle the broad principles of their policy and at once refer the execution to a committee strengthened by the appointment of sufficient men and women from outside their own body who are known to have made a study of the subject.

This committee is also likely by its constitution to delegate its authority. The majority of its members, being councillors with other responsibilities than those of education, may be expected to listen with intelligence to the counsels of the experts, but not themselves to undertake the duties of administration. They will find enough to do in settling the position and character of different schools, in discussing the annual budget, in appointing the chief officials, and in keeping the whole system of high schools, technical schools, commercial schools, elementary schools, and scholarships in healthy relationship.

They will probably welcome the opportunity of delegating the actual management of schools, not only because such delegation will be a relief to themselves, but also because it will afford examples of various methods of management from which they may be able to form future judgments.

The managers to whom such authority is delegated are people nominated by this committee.

There can, as a rule, be no difficulty in finding men and women who rise with pleasure to such a responsibility. It is often claimed as a glory of the British system of government that so much has

been left to voluntary service. Men and women—not only those of the classes from which magistrates and councillors have been drawn, but also such working men and women as manage with success co-operative stores, friendly societies, and trade-unions—are available, and as managers, bring to the use of a school knowledge and time—in some cases ideals—which save expense and improve the teaching. They see with their own eyes, and not, as officials see, with the eyes of their masters. They have the strength which comes of an official position without ceasing to be men and women under the influence of ever-changing thought and feeling.

There is no difficulty as to the way. Delegation is possible if once it is recognised as advisable. I would submit that it does offer the simplest means of attaining that union of control and initiative, of stability and freedom which is necessary to growth, and that the County Councils must try such means if they are to be successful.

The difficulty is to convince public opinion that delegation is advisable, and, to help in this, I would offer a result of my own experience. There is, I have found, a never-failing supply of men and women willing and able to enter the public service. They do not always go about seeking for something to do, and they resent the name of philanthropists; but a slight intimacy with their characters reveals a disposition to fulfil an obligation to society. The difficulty is to find something which such people can do. They do not care for the charity committee, with its vague, uncertain policy, its want of backbone. They will not stand an election, and they

shrink from officialism, with its dry and hard policy, its want of flesh and blood. They would do admirably if the duties of school management could be delegated; they would bring to the service of the community time, intelligence, public spirit, and care for the children; they would be glad of the responsibility, and get strength from the necessary official control.

Delegation alone can save the country from the pressure of some cast-iron system of education. In the men and women who are able both to bring in new ideas and to submit to control, the country has the means of forming bodies to whom such delegation is possible.

1903.

LABOUR AND CULTURE

"WHAT"—people ask themselves at the establishment of a new Government—"What is the most pressing need in legislation?" The answers knock together as they crowd for utterance. There is one for which I would gain a hearing. It does not strive nor cry in the streets, and yet it seems to me to have the words of national greatness. It is that a way may be opened for an alliance between knowledge and industry, between the Universities and the Labour Party. "Knowledge without industry"—slightly altering some words of Ruskin —"is selfishness. Industry without knowledge is brutality."

The Labour Party is obviously the coming power. Its coming is welcomed because it brings with it the force gained in the discipline of work and the sympathy learned by contact with sorrow and suffering. Workmen have, as a class, a simplicity of aim and a sincerity which are not so common among people who are familiar with the artificialities of luxury. They are not so ready to pose, and they have a larger capacity for sacrifice and generosity. They are used to waiting, they can work, and they can feel. They take politics seriously as a matter which concerns the daily bread of the people. The coming of the Labour Party is, therefore, welcome because it brings an element of reality into a

political struggle which now partakes too much of the nature of a game. The party has faith in its demands, and has, therefore, a force which is not exercised by parties who elaborate programmes with an eye to votes and put their trust in "tactics." But—and this is the serious matter—the Labour Party which has thought and faith has not knowledge.

Workmen are scant of life, that is, of the thoughts —the hopes—the visions and the wide human interests which come of knowledge. They try to supply the need by the excitement of drink, of gambling, or of pleasure. They do not rejoice in their own being or in the use of their minds, so their hopes are set on "having" rather than on "being." They depend on things without themselves and not on things in themselves. They are dull on holidays unless they find some outside excitement, and they shrink from solitude. The Labour Party, if it came into power to-morrow, would probably be set on its own material advantage just as the property class has been set on securing its property for itself. There would be change without progress. There would be the same carelessness of the things which made for common joy, the same indifference to beauty, the same exaltation of rights above duties. "Right won as rights," as Mazzini long ago said, "are apt to be exercised tyrannically."

Workmen are scant also, I think it may be said, of the wisdom which comes of knowledge. They have little idea of the forces on which the growth of society depends or of the ends to which it is moving. They are often slaves of one phrase to-day

and of another to-morrow. They are easily dazzled and as easily made suspicious. The speeches by which their votes are sought reveal their unfitness to direct a national policy. Their feeling is often right, and as individuals they are full of good-will, but they talk in public and sometimes act together as if selfishness were the one motive of every one's conduct. They are often disloyal to their own good nature. They have little sense of the tradition which makes honour more valuable than life, little realisation of the infinite complications of the body politic, little idea of the future or of the difficulties which lie in its path. "University men learn to see difficulties," was the admiring criticism of a workman who for want of such seeing had wrecked his hopes.

A Government directed by the Labour Party would probably illustrate Ruskin's warning. It would be in earnest; it would have faith in its purpose; but it would be "brutal" in its disregard for all the issues it did not understand. In its ignorance of the principles of progress, in its suspicion of foreigners, in its disregard for the unuttered needs of human nature, it would probably drive the ship of the State on the rocks. The Labour Party, if it is to give stability to the Greater England of the future, must have knowledge—as Wordsworth puts it—"of man, of nature, and of human life."

But how can workmen know what is in man or in themselves till in some poem or heroic epoch of history they have seen man's little self writ large? How can they rejoice in the reign of law till they have discovered its work in nature? How can they stand in reverent awe before human life till in the

study of mankind they have followed man's progress from the worship of force to the worship of love?

The workman of to-day is better off—is more healthy—is more self-respecting than the workman of thirty years ago. He has less superstition, but also less idealism. He is a closer prisoner of his senses, and is inclined to mock at offers of knowledge which will give him nothing more to taste, to touch, or to see. But without this knowledge he can neither satisfy himself nor add strength to the nation.

The Universities are the repositories of such knowledge. Their members have often in the past put the knowledge at the people's disposal, and there has been no successful revolution which has not had intellectual guidance, "Without a vision"—which is an effort of the mind—"the people go astray."

Oxford and Cambridge are the national repositories of the knowledge; they have also the money and the men. There are colleges with an income of £50,000 or £70,000 a year. The total annual income of the Oxford Colleges is perhaps £300,000 a year. The Universities have buildings whose stories preach of the country's glory; they have libraries and they have scholars. Their great resources are now for the most part absorbed in giving scholarships and fellowships to men, many of whom are in no need of money help. The great body of under-graduates more than pay for all they receive.

Here is a call for legislation. Oxford and Cambridge might be compelled to put a fair share of their resources at the service of workmen. They could establish hostels properly equipped with tutors where workmen might live for two or three years

studying their own interests from the University point of view. They could provide local committees of workmen with the guidance and the means for setting up in their own localities systems of teaching designed for the training of the mind which should have equal status with the systems designed for the training of the hand and the eye. They could offer greater hospitality to men desiring to become teachers in elementary schools; they could make themselves necessary to all teachers and distribute their knowledge by such channels to all classes of the people.

It is a sign of the times that the Trade Unions send relays of men to study at Ruskin College, in Oxford, and that an Association of Trade Unionists and Co-operators has been formed for the Higher Education of working men. There is, then, a demand—faint, indeed, but a real demand—for some more systematised teaching in the Humanities than that provided by the irregular choice and the irregular subscriptions of University Extension Committees. The Government might, by legislation, meet this demand. It might encourage more and more mind expansion in elementary education; it might make continuation schools compulsory, and then, as it forced the Universities to open some such way as has been here suggested of alliance with the Labour Party, the people would be gradually more inclined to walk in such way. Higher wages, better hours, freer land laws, and a more secure old age may also be objects for legislation, but means of livelihood are more certainly obtained by those who have the means of life than are the means of life by those who settle down on the lees of comfort.

1906.

A COLLEGE OF THE HUMANITIES

The University of London has authorised a course of study for evening students which will deal with "the history, literature, and art of ancient, mediæval, and modern times, so as to present a comprehensive view of the life of the people and of the forces moulding nations and communities."

This proposal marks a possible new departure in the education of Londoners. The teaching of science or of technical skill has had bold advertisement, and citizens who would improve their powers of learning have many opportunities of study. They are, indeed, often induced to take up the study by the sight of noble buildings devoted to these objects or by the appeals of orators and politicians.

The teaching of history, philosophy, literature, and art lurks all the time in holes and corners; it has no command of money and has little notice. The teachers are very often volunteers, the place of teaching a school or parish room, and the teaching without system or method. The subjects have thus come to be despised or regarded as matter for dilettanti and not serious students.

But these subjects were in old days regarded as the serious subjects, and for their seriousness

received the name of the "Humanities." The subjects which lead to bread-earning, even if they bind men to their fellow-citizens by ties of interest, are not sufficient. Workmen who by technical training have been fitted for their trade do not always satisfy employers, who have lately been asking for more original and more intelligent workers. Citizens who have been taught the duties of citizenship somehow fail to have respect for one another's opinions or to grasp noble ideals of a city or a nation. The subjects which to the present generation have seemed serious have not altogether prepared their students for the most serious part of life.

Schools of the Humanities were established in old days to give a teaching which would fit a man to play his part as a man with men—"human teaching." They opened a way by which men's minds might escape from the narrow limits of their trade, their class, their city, or their State, and come into touch with the life—the human life—which breathes through all men. They broke down the barriers between the individual and the universal thought which underlies all human actions, they offered to all comers a share of the joys in widest commonalty spread, and of the knowledge and literature which are the greatest possessions of the human race.

The chief need of the present time after religion, of which, indeed, it is a part, is for that teaching which will open for people the way to a knowledge of themselves and of others.

It is for want of familiarity with the larger self that so many go after drink and excitement, lose

interest in work, and live for pleasure. They cannot think to live, so they drink to live.

It is for want of the ability to understand one another's position that English and foreigners, masters and men, quarrel and go to war. They are not in touch with the common thought, and do not recognise it when it is expressed in a different form or in another language.

It is for want of principles that rival political parties tempt people with programmes and charm them to the polling-booths with chaff, flattery, or corrupting cries.

It is for want of real acquaintance with the source of national greatness, it is because of ignorance as to their really great men and as to their greatest possessions, that the moral basis of patriotism is so narrow and its aims often vulgar.

Philosophy, history, literature, and art, whose object it is to develop a man as a thinking and feeling being, are the serious subjects most necessary in a society whose life depends on individuals who think clearly and feel deeply. The teaching of these subjects does not, of course, exclude that of science. They will, indeed, be taught all the more effectively in a scientific atmosphere. Mr. Huxley has said that the greatest gift of science has not been the mechanical inventions which have enriched the age so much as the habit of more orderly thinking which it has spread far and wide. There is no necessary rivalry. The human mind needs training by scientific methods. This fact is recognised. It needs also training by the Humanities. This is not so generally recognised, and there is the consequent loss which has been noticed.

But it may be said that there is no demand for the teaching of philosophy, history, literature, and art—"people want bread and the country wants trade."

The essential demand, however, is not always that which is shouted in the streets—it has to be sought in out-of-the-way signs. People can never decide by their votes on their gifts. Their mouths ask for bread when their hearts demand the Word of God. Among the signs of the times are a dissatisfaction with isolation in a trade, a class, or a country; a riotous imagination, an unrest as of those whose powers are unused, a reliance on external support, on pleasure, on money, on force; an inability for peaceful soul-possession. People ask one thing with their lips, but their hearts ask to know what is the object of life; what system of theology or philosophy will support conduct or policy; what it is which makes the literature and art of a nation its greatest treasure.

The essential demand of the time is for the teaching of the Humanities.

The University of London has by its resolution taken the first step to meet this demand. Its authority has been given to a course of study extending over four years; and it has brought the study up to date by including some training in the principles on which evidence should be estimated. This supplement to the Humanities is in accord with a suggestion made by Lord Morley in a speech delivered many years ago at the Midland Institute. Its importance can hardly be exaggerated when it is remembered how often each individual is called on to decide questions of policy,

and how the commonwealth depends on such decisions.

The University has not as yet attached any distinction or special recognition beyond the certificate offered to those who complete the course of study. It is, of course, wise and useful to keep up the dignity of a degree, but it needs something else than a certificate to draw attention to a departure in education which may go so far in London life. The reason of the refusal to give more recognition is not very clear from the educational point of view. The matter, however, does not seem finally decided.

The next step will be the organisation of classes throughout London. Schemes of study must be mapped out starting from either philosophy, history, literature, or art, and covering different periods of time.

Lectures must be given in some central building in each of the four quarters of London, where the people may hear from the lips of the best teachers wide and stimulating views of their subject. Tutorial classes must also be arranged in convenient rooms in each quarter, where, in parties limited in number, students may have individual attention and feel the impulse of a teacher working with themselves. In conjunction with these classes there should be personally conducted visits to galleries and museums for the study of things bearing on their subjects, and, when possible, travelling should be organised for a like purpose. In this way Londoners would have presented to them a complete scheme of study and practicable means for following the scheme.

Immediate success could hardly be promised, but much would depend on the faith with which the scheme is put forward. If it is given bold advertisement by the support of the leaders of opinion; if it has funds to defray the expenses of organisation and pay the teachers; if the scheme is revealed in its completeness and not in patches of isolated lectures, the imagination of Londoners may be struck and students collected. The University Extension Society prepared the way; now the University of London takes up the work; but for further progress there must be more organised effort.

The experiment is worth trying. In America rich men have often given their money for experiments less promising. In London, is it too much to hope that rich men will back up the University in its object of helping Londoners to know the human life of which they are part as well as the material world in which they live? The Humanities have been slowly falling into disrepute among so-called practical people. Their revival is necessary, and the University of London has recognised the necessity, but without money much further progress is impossible.

1903.

PUBLIC AUTHORITIES AND ART COLLECTIONS

Galleries and museums are responsible for many a headache. The multitude of exhibits confuse the visitor's mind, which tires of leaping from object to object, from period to period, or from country to country. The apparent order is indeed a hopeless jumble in which the visitor misses any sense of connexion, and fails to find a thread on which to hang his thoughts The many objects do not suggest relations to other objects, yet it is those relations which make objects interesting. Furniture appears in positions which imply no human use. Ornaments are placed where they ornament nothing. Things are piled upon things regardless of the course of history or of the people who made them. A great gallery is often like a great sale-room of an auctioneer, where conscientious visitors use the catalogue as a sort of inventory, and tick off the treasures as they find them correctly entered. Or it may be compared to the store-room of a barbaric conqueror, who—not, indeed, by his sword, but by his wealth—has amassed booty from other nations, of the use of which he is himself ignorant.

The national art collections at the Victoria and Albert Museum appal the visitor by their extent and by their completeness. The director and his

staff do their work well as keepers, and the members of the Empire must feel proud as they walk for miles between cases containing objects of unknown values, and look upon the hangings and pictures and handiwork of all times and countries. There is nothing which is not cared for, and nothing which is not accurately described.

But still it is doubtful if any visitors except students get adequate benefit. They look, wonder, feel their heads ache, and go away sadder, perhaps prouder, but not wiser men and women. And yet educators are everywhere urging the importance of lessons from objects, and teachers are now encouraged to take children to local museums. The national collections must be preserved in their completeness, but there are ways by which they might be made to help in the education of the people as well as in that of students.

The addition of art galleries to municipal buildings has opened one way. It is now possible to borrow from the Victoria and Albert Museum a collection of things illustrating a country, a period, or a trade. It may, for instance, be decided to bring home to the people of a borough what is the life and art of China; or what sort of things were used and enjoyed in the time of Elizabeth or Anne; or what has been the gradual development of the furniture trade. The decision being taken, the local authorities would get from most willing and courteous officials every help in selecting what is wanted from the national collection. They would thus have at once a good nucleus of an exhibition around which to group other things lent by private owners.

Their next step would be to make a catalogue, remembering the oft-quoted dictum that the best exhibition is that which illustrates the catalogue. A catalogue has therefore to be devised which will give a short and popular account of the country, the period, or the trade. It must then go on to describe the exhibits in detail, the description following the lines of some consecutive thought. An exhibition, for instance, illustrating a country might show model rooms occupied by persons of different classes, the shops, the workshops, and the places of worship. In each of these might be placed the fitting things—furniture, pictures, and ornaments—all in their right position. Or it might be determined to show how the art of the country has been developed, and so by various examples the visitor's mind would be led on through case after case of art and treasures, never tired because always interested.

There are many different means of making an exhibition, but the essential thing seems to be an underlying unity, and the establishment of some link with the sympathy of the casual visitor who is not a student. This visitor must see something which is a whole, not a confusing jumble of unconnected parts, and he must, as a human being or as a member of a community, feel that he is looking at something which is not alien to himself, and which it is good to understand. The exhibition will, in American phrase, be "live" if it has unity and is connected with life.

In the Whitechapel Art Gallery there have been most successful exhibitions of this character. For periods of six weeks thousands of the neighbours

have learnt of some one country, widening their minds and improving their taste as they have sought, with human interest, to understand how strangers furnished their houses, how they worked, what ornaments they chose, how they did their everyday duties, what tools they used, how the country looked. One exhibition was designed to illustrate shipping, and there was a collection which showed how different people in different countries and periods have conquered the sea, what trades have grown up on sea coasts for the safety of ships, and how sea life has affected art. The prospect of what might be done with the stores of the national collection in reserve seems endless.

This paper, however, is written to commend to the municipalities the adoption of the same plan. Whitechapel has the advantage of a director who has rare qualifications uniting to a knowledge of art a sympathy with the popular mind. But Whitechapel has the disadvantage of narrow means. It depends for any extension of its work on voluntary subscriptions, and they are obtained only as the captures of some individual bow and spear. There have been other experiments in the same direction, notably that of Mr. T. C. Horsfall at Manchester, whose museum, formed there at the cost of much thought and money extending over many years, has shown teachers all over the world as to what things can say when they are arranged by people who think with their hearts. Sir Jonathan Hutchinson, at his museum at Haslemere, has shown in the same way how by simpler methods the sight of things may provoke connected and therefore interested thought.

Individual enterprise has been the pioneer; municipal action must now take up the work. In many cases buildings exist, the law permits the levying of a sufficient rate, and all that is wanted is the will of the electors that the national collections shall be used for their advantage. The London Education Authority might, by taking the control of the Bethnal Green Museum, show how thoughtful and sympathetic arrangement could make that somewhat desolate place hum with interest. The people have been sufficiently educated to be on the look-out for some new resources for their leisure. The resources they are choosing sometimes make observers anxious. The provision of a place free to enter, where they would be sure of finding something they could understand and recognise as beautiful, and where they could every three months reckon on seeing something new, would at once meet the need for new resources and for new knowledge. Lectures, classes, and great educational institutes will not avail by themselves to fit the nation to meet twentieth century needs: the use of leisure as much as the use of working hours determines character.

In our great national collections and in our municipal rates the material means exist for providing one resource for leisure which has been shown to meet the people's need.

1903.

THE PLACE OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN EDUCATION

FREE public Libraries have been generously established. Mr. Passmore Edwards and Mr. Carnegie have together contributed a sum of money little short of a million within the last few years. Will some Mr. Booth show that Libraries have failed? Critics are already plentiful. They complain that workmen are not readers, that the staff is employed in changing silly books for silly readers, that a "habit of mental loafing" is encouraged, and that the rates paid by the many are spent without commensurate public benefit.

Critics have from the beginning been inclined to railing accusations, and the critics who find such faults are not always familiar with the condition of the people. They do not realise, for instance, how children taught to read out of reading-books have in later years to be tempted to read, or how occupants of rooms in which a book-case is an unknown piece of furniture have to be encouraged to become familiar with books, or how minds in which education has dulled imagination, and hard work prevented experience turn to the excitement of fiction. They do not make allowance for the slow growth of new habits, nor do they recognise

that the beginning of use must often be misuse, and that for the spread of the best, supply must precede demand.

Public Libraries are playing a great part in modern education. The fine buildings make a bold advertisement of books, and in reply to the advertisement a growing number of people have become familiar with the country's literature. The catalogues awaken curiosity and bring men and women to the reference Library to find out more of what they hear. Books have come to be more frequently recognised as companions, and in some cases have been accepted as friends. The possession of a Library may tend to increase self-respect among the possessors even when the books themselves are not valued. Equality of opportunity, even when it is not used, often develops a sense of equality.

But approval of public Libraries is not necessarily satisfaction with them. The critics have some truth on their side, and Libraries might do much more—must, indeed, do much more—if there is not to be a reaction against their establishment.

The public Libraries are not sufficiently used. Birmingham, for instance, with a population of 522,000, has only 30,000 borrowers at all its Libraries; half of these borrowers are children and young people under twenty years of age, one-third of the whole is made up of teachers and students, and over 50 per cent, of the books borrowed are books of fiction. Canning Town, a working-class neighbouroood, has under 4,500 borrowers, of whom over 2,000 are under twenty-one years of age and 1,335 are teachers or pupils. The proportion of fiction here reaches 75 per cent. In Stepney

Borough, with four Libraries and a quarter of a million of inhabitants, there are only 6,042 adults with readers' tickets. The examination of a large number of Library reports shows results which are strangely identical. Something must be done to get the books more widely used and also to improve the character of the books commonly read.

The reform which most immediately presses is one which will connect Libraries with educational institutions. They are at present too closely modelled after the fashion of circulating Libraries and aspire to be nothing more than the Mudies of the industrial population. There is little direction given as to which are the best books, there is no guide at hand for the help of readers to understand what they read, no stimulus for any one to take up a course of study, no personally conducted tours for people who would travel in the world of literature.

Libraries should be a department in some educational institution or system. The books should be issued in one room, but in other rooms in the same building there should be classes, lectures, and exhibitions. The books should send their readers to the classes, the classes should send their students to the Library. Much has been lately said about the importance of "atmosphere"; books should be stored in "a studious atmosphere."

This reform would mean in many cases the building of additional rooms to the present Libraries —a Lecture-room, some class rooms, and, if possible, space in which exhibitions might be held. Rich benefactors might make the provision of such accommodation a condition when they provide new

Libraries, or they might add such rooms to those already established.

The Education Authority, having brought Libraries and public education under the same control, might make Libraries a part of the education system and arrange for the close co-operation of all Librarians and teachers. The ratepayers might then view the raising the rate above the penny in the pound with less jealousy, or they might join in an attempt to secure for Libraries as for other educational agencies a grant from the Government. There would be a double advantage in such a grant. The expense of education, in the benefit of which the nation shares, would not fall exclusively on what must often be a poor area, and the receipt of a grant would involve—what Mr. Greenwood regards with the greatest favour—the visit of an inspector, who would help to make more common the methods of the best librarians, and help also too easy-going authorities to get rid of bad librarians.

There are, however, some other reforms possible and more immediate. The Reports take credit for additions to the Libraries, and evidently much energy of the librarians goes in this direction. Their energy might be more profitably turned to popularising the books already on the shelves. A few show what all might do. They might issue small subject-catalogues, with sometimes a word of comment on the more valuable books; get lecturers to give special lectures on novels or travels; enlist volunteers who would help in distributing books, especially to children, or who would go to the schools and give a short account

of some of the worthiest and most attractive tales. They might also, when lectures are given in their neighbourhood, send out a list of books bearing on the subject, to be hung by the lecturer's platform and, if possible, to be announced by the chairman. They might also watch the papers, and when some event occurs in nature or in politics—an earthquake, a revolution, a debate on African or Russian affairs—they might hang on the Library notice-board a broadsheet with the names of books which would inform the minds of newspaper readers.

Librarians, in a word, might be encouraged to be missionaries rather than collectors of books and makers of catalogues. Their duty, as is that of the best teachers in industrial centres, is to create and not supply demand—to make the people thirsty rather than to supply them with drink. They must, therefore, follow the way of advertisers and by continual restatements, by frequent change in their methods, and by persistent pushing, keep before the people the possibilities of profit and pleasure, the friendship of the really great men and women, the knowledge for which their minds are made, and which lies waiting for them in books.

The issue of so much silly fiction is not only bad for the readers; it prejudices the popularity of the Library movement. "Why," argues the man who never reads, "should I provide rubbish for my neighbours to read?"

The charge is often unfair, and the fiction issued is by no means always rubbish. The true and only way of getting rid of the silly is to popularise the good. "I never issue a silly popular

book without putting on the cover a list of good fiction," said one American librarian. "Give me a Scott, to take the taste out of my mouth," is recorded as a saying of Dean Stanley's after reading a modern novel. Active librarians, well supported, might so raise taste as to make silly books distasteful.

There is one practicable way of reform which would at once do something to unite the educational system with Libraries. The Home Reading Union has its courses of studies designed for various circles of readers, and it publishes an organ containing valuable and stimulating suggestions. Why should not reading circles be started in every Library? Why should not the organ be adapted to each locality? The closer amalgamation of the Library and education authorities might make the teachers in each district more ready to take up the conduct of reading circles as part of their work, and librarians more ready to give facilities; but there is no need to wait for such amalgamation to make a beginning.

The Home Reading Union has thought out systems of reading on various subjects. It publishes these systems in such a way that any casual reader wishing to know about a subject has a guide to the books he should read. There are many such casual readers, and it is pathetic to notice the time they waste plodding through books to which they have been attracted just by the title—books out of date and doomed to dull any enthusiasm.

"The reading which is done by the mass of the people," says one librarian, "is desultory, unsystematic, and indiscriminating."

These casual readers need first of all guidance as to the books they should read, and secondly the stimulus of companionship in their reading. If the Home Reading Union could supply librarians with directions to readers as to books which light up the road to different subjects; if these directions might be exhibited in the Libraries; if it could offer men or women willing as volunteers to conduct circles; if the librarians would post the notices, put the books noticed on the shelves, and give facilities for the meetings of the circles, the two needs would be in some measure supplied.

There are probably already in the neighbourhood of each Library many persons taking classes and working parochial Libraries. It is the old tale of want of organisation and of a sort of parochial patriotism which is blind to larger possibilities. Volunteer workers float about like clouds whose moisture never reaches the earth—they need a condensing-point. Public Libraries are such condensing-points, and through them volunteers might reach the public and bring to them the books refreshing to the mind. Voluntary service might connect itself with municipal organisations.

Who will take the initiative, the Home Reading Union or the public Libraries?

Dr. Garnett, C.B., once gave weighty reasons for action. "Free Libraries," he said, "were principally established to meet a different condition of things from that which prevails at present. Then the enemy was ignorance; now it is barbarism. . . . There is at present more half-knowledge than dense ignorance. . . . The public cannot retrograde to the condition of entire ignorance;

the system of general public instruction ensures at least a minimum of knowledge, though not of taste. Thus, continuance in what may be termed a semi-civilised condition is not only bad for themselves but presents a danger to the class immediately above them—the danger that, to attract an uninstructed multitude, the standard of literature may be gradually debased. This is a real and serious danger." Dr. Garnett is associated, therefore, with the appeal that men and women inspired by the enthusiasm of humanity may turn public Libraries into "citadels of culture." 1902.

P.S.—The Home Reading Union has taken some steps in this direction, and has now an organ which is adapted to each locality and serves to interest readers in books. Progress is being made, and many librarians have taken active steps to make Libraries part of the educational system, but there is still a long way between the present and the ideal sketched above.

1908.

THE BEGINNING OF TOYNBEE HALL

"How did the idea of a University Settlement arise?" "What was the beginning?" are questions so often asked by Americans, Frenchmen, Belgians, or the younger generation of earnest English people, that it seems worth while to reply in print, and to trundle one's mind back to those early days of effort and loneliness before so many bore the burden and shared the anxiety. The fear is that in putting pen to paper on matters which are so closely bound up with our own lives, the sin of egotism will be committed, or that a social plant, which is still growing, may be damaged, as even weeds are if their roots are looked at. And yet in the tale which has to be told there is so much that is gladdening and strengthening to those who are fighting apparently forlorn causes that I venture to tell it in the belief that to some our experiences will give hope.

In the year 1869, Mr. Edward Dennison took up his abode in East London. He did not stay long nor accomplish much, but as he breathed the air of the people he absorbed something of their sufferings, saw things from their standpoint, and, as his letters in his memoirs show, made frequent suggestions for social remedies. He was the first settler, and was followed by the late Mr. Edmund Hollond, to whom

my husband and I owe our life in Whitechapel. He was ever on the outlook for men and women who cared for the people, and hearing that we wished to come eastward, wrote to Dr. Jackson, then Bishop of London, when the living of St. Jude's fell vacant in the autumn of 1872, and asked that it might be offered to Mr. Barnett, who was at that time working as curate at St. Mary's Bryanston Square, with Mr. Fremantle, now the Dean of Ripon. I have the Bishop's letter, wise, kind, and fatherly, the letter of a general sending a young captain to a difficult outpost. "Do not hurry in your decision," he wrote; "it is the worst parish in my diocese, inhabited mainly by a criminal population, and one which has, I fear, been much corrupted by doles."

How well I remember the day Mr. Barnett and I first came to see it!—a sulky sort of drizzle filled the atmosphere; the streets, dirty and ill-kept, were crowded with vicious and bedraggled people, neglected children, and overdriven cattle. The whole parish was a network of courts and alleys, many houses being let out in single furnished rooms for 8d. a night—a bad system, which lent itself to every form of evil, to thriftless habits, to untidiness, to loss of self-respect, to unruly living, to vicious courses.

We did not "hurry in our decision," but just before Christmas, 1872, Mr. Barnett became vicar. A month later we were married, and took up our lives' work on the 6th of March, 1873, accompanied by our friend Edward Leonard, who joined us "to do what he could"; his "could" being ultimately the establishment of the Whitechapel committee of the Charity Organisation Society, and a change in

the lives and ideals of a large number of young people, whom he gathered round him to hear of the Christ he worshipped.

It would sound like exaggeration if I told my memories of those times. The previous vicar had had a long and disabling illness, and all was out of order. The church, unserved either by curate, choir, or officials, was empty, dirty, unwarmed. Once the platform of popular preachers, Mr. Hugh Allen and Mr. (now Bishop) Thornton, it had had huge galleries built to accommodate the crowds who came from all parts of London to hear them—galleries which blocked the light, and made the subsequent emptiness additionally oppressive. The schools were closed, the school-rooms all but devoid of furniture, the parish organisation *nil;* no mothers' meeting, no Sunday School, no communicants' class, no library, no guilds, no music, no classes, nothing alive. Around this barren, empty shell surged the people, here to-day, gone to-morrow. Thieves and worse, receivers of stolen goods, hawkers, casual dock labourers, every sort of unskilled low-class cadger congregated in the parish. There was an Irish quarter and a Jews' quarter, while whole streets were given over to the hangers-on of a vicious population, people whose conduct was brutal, whose ideal was idleness, whose habits were disgusting, and among whom goodness was laughed at, the honest man and the right-living woman being scorned as impracticable. Robberies, assaults, and fights in the streets were frequent; and to me, a born coward, it grew into a matter of distress when we became sufficiently well known in the parish for our presence to stop, or at least to moderate, a

fight; for then it seemed a duty to join the crowd, and not to follow one's nervous instincts and pass by on the other side. I recall one breakfast being disturbed by three fights outside the Vicarage. We each went to one, and the third was hindered by a hawker friend who had turned verger, and who fetched the distant policeman, though he evidently remained doubtful as to the value of interference.

We began our work very quietly and simply: opened the church (the first congregation was made up of six or seven old women, all expecting doles for coming), restarted the schools, established relief committees, organised parish machinery, and tried to cauterise, if not to cure, the deep cancer of dependence which was embedded in all our parishioners alike, lowering the best among them and degrading the worst. At all hours, on all days, and with every possible pretext, the people came and begged. To them we were nothing but the source from which to obtain tickets, money, or food; and so confident were they that help would be forthcoming that they would allow themselves to get into circumstances of suffering or distress easily foreseen, and then send round to *demand* assistance.

I can still recall my emotions when summoned to a sick woman in Castle Alley, an alley long since pulled down, where the houses, three storeys high, were hardly 6 feet apart; the sanitary accommodation, pits in the cellars; and the whole place only fit for the condemnation it got directly Cross's Act was passed. This alley, by the way, was in part the cause of Cross's Act, so great an impression did it make on Lord Cross (then Mr. Cross) when Mr. Barnett induced him to come down and see it.

In this stinking alley, in a tiny, dirty room, all the windows broken and stuffed up, lay the woman who had sent for me. There were no bed-clothes; she lay on a sacking covered with rags.

"I do not know you," said I, "but I hear you want to see me."

"No, ma'am!" replied a fat, beer-sodden woman by the side of the bed, producing a wee, new-born baby; "we don't know yer, but 'ere's the babby, and in course she wants clothes and the mother comforts like. So we jist sent round to the church."

This was a compliment to the organisation which represented Christ, but one which showed how sunken was the character which could not make even the simplest provision for an event which must have been expected for months, and which even the poorest among the respectable counts sacred.

The refusal of the demanded doles made the people very angry. Once the Vicarage windows were broken; once we were stoned by an angry crowd, who also hurled curses at us as we walked down a criminal-haunted street, and howled out, as a climax of their wrongs, "And it's us as pays 'em." But we lived all this down, and as the years went by reaped a harvest of love and gratitude which is one of the gladdest possessions of our lives, and is quite disproportionate to the service we have rendered. But this is the end of the story, and I must go back to the beginning.

In a parish which occupies only a few acres, and was inhabited by 8,000 persons, we were confronted by some of the hardest problems of city life. The housing of the people, the superfluity of unskilled

labour, the enforcement of resented education, the liberty of the criminal classes to congregate and create a low public opinion, the administration of the Poor Law, the amusement of the ignorant, the hindrances to local government (in a neighbourhood devoid of the leisured and cultured), the difficulty of uniting the unskilled men and women in trade unions, the necessity for stricter Factory Acts, the joylessness of the masses, the hopelessness of the young—all represented difficult problems, each waiting for a solution and made more complicated by the apathy of the poor, who were content with an unrighteous contentment and patient with a Godless patience. These were not the questions to be replied to by doles, nor could the problems be solved by kind acts to individuals nor by the healing of the suffering, which was but the symptom of the disease.

In those days these difficulties were being dealt with mainly by good kind women, generally elderly; few men, with the exception of the clergy and noted philanthropists, as Lord Shaftesbury, were interested in the welfare of the poor, and economists rarely joined close experience with their theories.

"If men, cultivated, young, thinking men, could only know of those things they would be altered," I used to say, with girlish faith in human goodwill—a faith which years has not shaken; and in the spring of 1875 we went to Oxford, partly to tell about the poor, partly to enjoy "eights week" with a group of young friends. Our party was planned by Miss Toynbee, whom I had met when at school, and whose brother Arnold was then an undergraduate at Balliol. Our days were filled

by the hospitality with which Oxford still rejoices its guests; but in the evenings we used to drop quietly down the river with two or three earnest men, or sit long and late in our lodgings in the Turl, and discuss the mighty problems of poverty and the people. How vividly Canon Barnett and I can recall each and all of that first group of "thinking men," so ready to take up enthusiasms in their boyish strength—Arnold Toynbee, Sidney Ball, W. H. Forbes, Arthur Hoare, Leonard Montefiore, Alfred Milner, Philip Gell, John Falk, G. E. Underhill, Ralph Whitehead, Lewis Nettleship! Some of these are still here and caring for our people, but others have passed behind the veil, where perhaps earth's sufferings are explicable.

We used to ask each undergraduate as he developed interest to come and stay in Whitechapel, and see for himself. And they came, some to spend a few weeks, some for the Long Vacation, while others, as they left the University and began their life's work, took lodgings in East London, and felt all the fascination of its strong pulse of life, hearing, as those who listen always may, the hushed, unceasing moans underlying the cry which ever and anon makes itself heard by an unheeding public.

From that visit to Oxford in the "eights week" of 1875 date many visits to both the Universities. Rarely a term passed without our going to Oxford, where the men who had been down to East London introduced us to others who might do as they had done. Sometimes we stayed with Dr. Jowett, the immortal master of Balliol, sometimes we were the guests of the undergraduates, who would get up meetings in their rooms, and organise innumerable

breakfasts, teas, river excursions, and other opportunities for introducing the subject of the duty of the cultured to the poor and degraded.

No organisation was started, no committee, no society, nor club founded. We met men, told them of the needs of the out-of-sight poor; and many came to see Whitechapel and stayed to help it. And so eight years went by—our Oxford friends laughingly terming my husband the "unpaid professor of social philosophy."

. . . . .

In June, 1883, we were told by Mr. Moore Smith that some men at St. John's College at Cambridge were wishful to do something for the poor, but that they were not quite prepared to start an ordinary College Mission. Mr. Barnett was asked to suggest some other possible and more excellent way. The letter came as we were leaving for Oxford, and was slipped with others in my husband's pocket. Soon something went wrong with the engine and delayed the train so long that the passengers were allowed to get out. We seated ourselves on the railway bank, just then glorified by masses of large ox-eyed daisies, and there he wrote a letter suggesting that men might hire a house, where they could come for short or long periods, and, living in an industrial quarter, learn to "sup sorrow with the poor." The letter pointed out that close personal knowledge of individuals among the poor must precede wise legislation for remedying their needs, and that as English local government was based on the assumption of a leisured, cultivated class, it was necessary to provide it artificially in those regions where the line of

leisure was drawn just above sleeping hours, and where the education ended at thirteen years of age and with the three R's.

That letter founded Toynbee Hall. Insomnia had sapped my health for a long time, and later, in the autumn of that year, we were sent to Eaux Bonnes to try a water-cure. During that period the Cambridge letter was expanded into a paper, which was read at a College meeting at St John's College, Oxford, in November of the same year. Mr. Arthur Sidgwick was present, and it is largely due to his practical vigour that the idea of University Settlements in the industrial working-class quarters of large towns fell not only on sympathetic ears, but was guided until it came to fruition, and the first meeting of undergraduates met in the room of Mr. Cosmo Lang [now (1908) about to become Archbishop of York]. Soon after the meeting a small but earnest committee was formed; later on the committee grew in size and importance, money was obtained on debenture bonds, and a head sought who would turn the idea into a fact. Here was the difficulty. Such men as had been pictured in the paper which Mr. Knowles had published in the *Nineteenth Century Review* of February, 1884, are not met with every day; and no inquiries seemed to discover the wanted man who would be called upon to give all and expect nothing.

Mr. Barnett and I had spent eleven years of life and work in Whitechapel. We were weary. My health stores were limited and often exhausted, and family circumstances had given us larger means and opportunities for travel. We were therefore desirous to turn our backs on the strain, the pain,

the passion, and the poverty of East London, at least for a year or two, and take repose after work which had both aged and weakened us. But no other man was to be found who would and could do the work; and, if this child-thought was not to die, it looked as if we must undertake to try and rear it.

We went to the Mediterranean to consider the matter, and solemnly, on a Sunday morning, made our decision. How well I recall the scene as we sat at the end of the quaint harbour-pier at Mentone, the blue waves dancing at our feet, everything around scintillating with light and movement in contrast to the dull and dulling squalor of the neighbourhood which had been our home for eleven years, and which our new decision would make our home for another indefinite spell of labour and effort. "God help us!" we said to each other; and then we wired home to obtain the refusal of the big Industrial School next to St. Jude's Vicarage, which had recently been vacated, and which we thought to be a good site for the first Settlement, and returned to try and live up to the standard which we had unwittingly set for ourselves in describing in the article the unknown man who was wanted for Warden.

The rest of the story is soon told. The committee did the work, bought the land, engaged the architect (Mr. Elijah Hoole), raised the money, and interested more and more men, who came for varying periods either to live, to visit, or to see what was being done.

. . . . .

On the 10th of March, 1883, Arnold Toynbee had died. He had been our beloved and faithful

friend ever since, as a lad of eighteen, his own mind then being chiefly concerned with military interests and ideals, he had heard, with the close interest of one treading untrodden paths, facts about the toiling, ignorant multitude whose lives were stunted by labour, clouded by poverty, and degraded by ignorance. He had frequently been to see us at St. Jude's, staying sometimes a few nights, oftener tempting us to go a day or two with him into the country; and ever wooing us with persistent hospitality to Oxford. Once, in 1879, he had taken rooms over the Charity Organisation office in Commercial Road, hoping to spend part of the Long Vacation, learning of the people; but his health, often weakly, could not stand the noise of the traffic, the sullenness of the aspect, nor the pain which stands waiting at every corner; and at the end of some two or three weeks he gave up the plan and left East London, never to return excepting as our welcome guest. His share of the movement was at Oxford, where with a subtle force of personality he attracted original or earnest minds of all degrees, and turned their thoughts or faces towards the East End and its problems. Through him many men came to work with us, while others were stirred by the meetings held in Oxford or by the pamphlet called the "Bitter Cry," which, in spite of its exaggerations, aroused many to think of the poor; or by the stimulating teaching of Professor T. H. Green, and by the constant kindly sympathy of the late Master of Balliol, who startled some of his hearers, who had not plumbed the depths of his wide, wise sympathy, by advising all young men, whatever their

career, "to make some of their friends among the poor."

. . . . .

The 10th of March, 1884, was a Sunday, and on the afternoon of that day Balliol chapel was filled with a splendid body of men who had come together from all parts of England in loving memory of Arnold Toynbee, on the anniversary of his death. Dr. Jowett had asked my husband to preach to them, and they listened, separating almost silently at the chapel porch, filled, one could almost feel, by the aspiration to copy him in caring much, if not doing much, for those who had fallen by the way or were "ignorant of our glorious gains."

We had often chatted, those of us who were busy planning the new Settlement, as to what to call it. We did not mean the name to be descriptive; it should, we thought, be free from every possible savour of a Mission, and yet it should, in itself, be suggestive of a noble aim. As I sat on that Sunday afternoon in the chapel, one of the few women among the crowd of strong-brained, clean-living men assembled in reverent affection for one man, the thought flashed to me, "Let us call the Settlement Toynbee Hall." To Mr. Bolton King, the honorary secretary of the committee, had come the same idea, and it, finding favour with the committee, was so decided, and our new Settlement received its name before a brick was laid or the plans concluded.

On the first day of July, 1884, the workmen began to pull down the old Industrial School, and to adapt such of it as was possible for the new uses; and on Christmas Eve, 1884, the first settlers,

Mr. H. D. Leigh, of Corpus, and Mr. C. H. Grinling, of Hertford, slept in Toynbee Hall, quickly followed by thirteen residents, most of whom had been living in the neighbourhood of Whitechapel, some for a considerable length of time, either singly or in groups, one party inhabiting a small disused public-house, others in model dwellings or in lodgings, none of them being altogether suitable for their own good or the needs of those whom they would serve. Those men had become settlers before the Settlement scheme was conceived, and as such were conversant with the questions in the air. It was an advantage, also, that they were of different ages, friends of more than one University generation, and linked together by a common friendship to us.

The present Dean of Ripon had for many years lent his house at No. 3, Ship Street for our use, and so had enabled us to spend some consecutive weeks of each summer at Oxford; and during those years we had learnt to know the flower of the University, counting, as boy friends, some men who have since become world-widely known; some who have done the finest work and "scorned to blot it with a name"; and others who, as civil servants, lawyers, doctors, country gentlemen, business men, have in the more humdrum walks of life carried into practice the same spirit of thoughtful sympathy which first brought them to inquire concerning those less endowed and deprived of life's joys, or those who, handicapped by birth, training, and environment, had fallen by the way.

. . . . .

As to what Toynbee Hall has done and now is

doing, it is difficult for any one, and impossible for me, to speak. Perhaps I cannot be expected to see the wood for the trees. Those who have cared to come and see for themselves what is being done, to stay in the house and join in its work, know that Toynbee Hall, Whitechapel, is a place where twenty University men live in order to work for, to teach, and learn of the poor. Since 1884 the succession of residents has never failed. Men of varied opinions and many views, both political and religious, have lived harmoniously together, some staying as long as fifteen years, others remaining shorter periods. All have left behind them marks of their residence; sometimes in the policy of the local Boards, of which they have become members; or in relation to the Student Residences; or the Antiquarian, Natural History, or Travelling Clubs which individuals among them have founded; or by busying themselves with classes, debates, conferences, discussions. Their activities have been unceasing and manifold, but looking over many years and many men, it seems to my inferior womanly mind that the best work has been done by those men who have cared most deeply for individuals among the poor. Out of such deep care has grown intimate knowledge of their lives and industrial position, and from knowledge has come improvement in laws, conditions, or administration. It is such care that has awakened in the people the desire to seek what is best. It is the care of those who, loving God, have taught others to know Him. It is the care of those who, pursuing knowledge and rejoicing in learning, have spread it among the ignorant more effectively than books,

classes, or lectures could have done. It is the care for the degraded which alone arouses them to care for themselves. It is the care for the sickly, the weak, the oppressed, the rich, the powerful, the happy, the teacher and taught, the employed and the employer, which enables introduction to be made and interpretation of each other to be offered and accepted. From this seed of deep individual care has grown a large crop of friendship, and many flowers of graceful acts.

It is the duty of Toynbee Hall, situated as it is at the gate of East London, to play the part of a skilful host and introduce the East to the West; but all the guests must be intimate friends, or there will be social blunders. To quote some words out of a Report, Toynbee Hall is "an association of persons, with different opinions and different tastes; its unity is that of variety; its methods are spiritual rather than material; it aims at permeation rather than at conversion; and its trust is in friends linked to friends rather than in organisation."

. . . . .

It was a crowded meeting of the Universities Settlements Association that was held in Balliol Hall in March, 1892, it being known that Dr. Jowett, who had recently been dangerously ill, would take the chair. He spoke falteringly (for he was still weakly), and once there came an awful pause that paled the hearers who loved him, in fear for his well-being. He told something of his own connexion with the movement; of how he had twice stayed with us in Whitechapel, and had seen men's efforts to lift this dead weight of

ignorance and pain. He referred to Arnold Toynbee, one of "the purest-minded of men," and one who "troubled himself greatly over the unequal position of mankind." He told of the force of friendship which was to him sacred, and "some of which should be offered to the poor." He dwelt on his own hopes for Toynbee Hall, of its uses to Oxford, as well as to Whitechapel; and he spoke also of us and our work, but those words were conceived by his friendship for and his faith in us, and hardly represented the facts. They left out of sight what the Master of Balliol could only imperfectly know—the countless acts of kindness, the silent gifts of patient service, and the unobtrusive lives of many men; their reverence before weakness and poverty, their patience with misunderstanding, their faith in the power of the best, their tenderness to children and their boldness against vice. These are the foundations on which Toynbee Hall has been built, and on which it aims to raise the ideals of human life, and strengthen faith in God.

1903.

A RETROSPECT OF TOYNBEE HALL

In 1883 a paper published in the *Nineteenth Century* suggested "University Settlements in our great towns." There are now Toynbee Hall, Oxford House, Mansfield House, the Bermondsey Settlement, Cambridge House, Caius House, Newman House, Browning Hall, the Southwark Ladies' Settlement, and Mayfield House in London. There are settlements in Glasgow, Bristol, Manchester, and Edinburgh. There are Hull House in Chicago, Andover House in Boston, besides innumerable others in different cities of America.

The paper was an expression of what was in many minds and of what others' work had prepared. The movement which followed its publication was an indication of a strong stream of thought already running.

After many years, therefore, the question to be asked those who would estimate the value of Settlements is not, "What did the paper say?" but, "What did it mean, and how far have existing Settlements carried out the meaning?"

In 1883 there was a stirring in the waters of benevolence which are for the healing of the weak. Men and women felt a new impulse towards doing good, and that impulse took shape in the creation

of these Halls and Houses. What was the impulse? Why has "the plan of settlement" extended?

Three causes may be suggested.

I

Distrust of Machinery.

Many people had become distrustful of the machinery for doing good. Men at the Universities, especially those who directly or indirectly felt the influence of T. H. Green, were asking for some other way than that of institutions by which to reach their neighbours. They heard the "bitter cry" of the poor; they were conscious of something wrong underneath modern progress; they realised that Free Trade, Reform Bills, philanthropic activity, and Missions had made neither health nor wealth. They were drawn to do something for the poor. Charity Organisation Societies had taught them not to give doles; they had turned from preachers who said, "Give up your business and live as monks"; they were not contented with reformers who came saying, "Change the laws, and all will be well," nor with philanthropists who said, "Support our charity to meet the need," nor with religious teachers who said, "Subscribe to our Church or Mission."

They felt that they were bound to be themselves true to the call which had summoned them to the business and enjoyment of life, and they distrusted machinery. The Poor Law, the chief machine, seemed to have developed pauperism, fostering the spirit which "bullies or cringes." Societies had become empty shells, occupied only by officials, who

had found pleasant quarters in the forms created by the life gift of the founders. Missions in making proselytes seemed sometimes to corrupt men.

Philanthropy, indeed, appeared to many to be a sort of mechanical figure beautifully framed by men to do their duty to their brother men—made with long arms, so as to reach all needs, and with iron frame so as to be never tired. It saved its inventors all further care beyond that of supplying it with money. Drop in a coin, and the duty to a neighbour was done. But duty so done proved often more harmful than helpful. A society acting by rules sometimes patched "hearts which were breaking with handfuls of coals and rice." The best-devised mechanism can have neither eyes nor feeling. It must act blindly, and cannot evoke gratitude.

Thus it came about that a group of men and women at the Universities distrusted machinery for doing good. They were between two duties. On the one side they were bound to be true to themselves and do their own work. On the other side they were bound by other means than by votes and subscriptions to meet the needs of the poor. They welcomed, therefore, the proposal for a Settlement where they might live their own lives and also make friends among the poor.

II

Demand for more Information.

Alongside of this distrust of machinery was a demand for more accurate information as to the condition of the people, as to their thoughts and

their hopes. The sensational descriptions of the ill-housed, the ill-paid, and the ignorant had roughly awakened easy-going citizens, but those descriptions did not give assurance that they represented facts or their meaning. A generation which had breathed something of the modern scientific spirit was not content with hearsay knowledge and with sentimental references; it required facts and figures—critical investigation into the causes of poverty and personal knowledge of the poor. Thus it was that many men and women received with favour a proposal that they themselves should go and live in a neighbourhood where they would come into contact with the industrial classes, see with their own eyes their houses and surroundings, and hear from their own lips how they lived.

III

Growth of the Human Spirit.

The Human Spirit is always growing in strength. It bursts traditions as the life in a tree bursts the bark which protected its tender age. It strains to reach beyond class distinctions, old habits, party lines, and anything which hinders man from helping man. Nowhere is the growth of this human spirit more evident than at the Universities.

In those years there was a clear recognition that old forms of benevolence were often patronising in character, that Charities and Missions often assumed a superiority in their supporters, and that sectarian philanthropy often developed party bitterness. Many men and women, therefore, anxious to assert their fellowship with the poor, resented the ways which in the name of love made their brothers

humble themselves to take gifts. They did not want to appear as "benefactors" or as "missionaries." They had no belief in their nostrum as a Morrison's pill for the cure of all evils. Their desire was, as human beings, to help human beings, and their human feeling protested against forms of help which put the interest of a class or of a party before that of individuals, reaching out handfuls of gifts across impassable gulfs and making party shibboleths the condition of association.

Working people, on the other side, under the influence of the same human spirit, had come more and more to resent exclusion from the good things enjoyed by other classes. They wanted to know more of what their richer neighbours did, and at any rate before heaving a brick at an aristocrat they desired to find out something about him.

Thus it was that a way was prepared for a suggestion that members of the University might live as neighbours of the poor, and, without affecting the superiority of an ascetic life, or claiming to have come as teachers, or having any sectarian object, might form the friendships which are the channels of all true service.

The establishment of Settlements is the work of those who believe that the gifts to modern times are good; that culture is gain, not loss; that cleanliness is better than dirt, beauty better than ugliness, knowledge better than ignorance—Isaacs not to be sacrificed. Settlements stand as an acknowledgment of the claims of all the citizens to a share in these good things, and as a protest against meeting those claims by the substitution of philanthropic machinery for human hands and

personal knowledge. They express the desire on the part of those "who have" to see, to know, and to serve those "who have not."

How far have Settlements succeeded?

Settlements are not to be judged out of the mouths of their critics or supporters. Both try them by measures used for weighing and testing things seen and felt. They fasten, therefore, on what is done for education, for relief, or for entertainment, and they give praise or blame. They compare the lists of classes, the results of examinations; they count up the number relieved or converted; they get out accounts of entertainments, and say, "How small," or "How great." It may be, it probably is, the case that much of the strength of Settlements has gone to such objects, and that some of the Houses and Halls have become identified with special methods and special objects. But my claim is that Settlements are not fairly judged by such standards.

A Settlement as it seems.

Toynbee Hall, for example, is not what it seems. The visitor who, Baedecker in hand, is shown over the lecture-room, the library, and the class-rooms, and hears that there are 1,000 or 1,500 students, imagines that the sitting-rooms and bedrooms are occupied by men who give up their time to teaching and lecturing. "All the residents are, I suppose, professors," is a frequent American comment. Such visitors are apt to go away regarding the place as a centre of education.

If, however, the visitor happens to be told that

most of the residents concern themselves with other objects, he makes up his mind that this object must be "temperance" or "conversion." He asks, "What is the effect of the work on the criminal population?" "Are the lowest people attracted?" "What is the spiritual outcome of the movement?" He gets, perhaps, as an answer, "that spiritual results are not visible," "that the residents have friends and acquaintances of all sorts," "that there is no common action which could be called the work of the place." He feels that his questions may have been impertinent, and he goes away somewhat confused, but on the whole assured that the place is a sort of Mission.

If a visitor with more time or perseverance arrives in the evening, he finds, perhaps, the lecture-room filled with students, the class-rooms occupied by small groups studying English or foreign literature, the principles of science or economics, the laboratory in the hands of a few practical workers, the library in the use of its quiet readers, the club-room noisy with the hum of talk about excursions, entertainments, and parties to be undertaken by the Students' Union. He is told that the distinction of all the educational work is that it is for the encouragement of knowledge which is not saleable, that lectures and classes aim at adding joy to life rather than of pence to wages, that their object is the better use of leisure time rather than of work time. He then determines that the place is a sort of polytechnic, with "University" classes in place of "technical" classes; he wonders so much is done without endowment; he criticises or admires. But when, the next moment, he goes into the drawing-room to find a party of Whitechapel neighbours or of East

London teachers in the hands of a host with whom they are making merry, and passes by the tennis-court, which is occupied by an ambulance corps, into the dining-room, to find a conference of trades unionists, co-operators, or friendly society members discussing with leading thinkers and politicians some matter of policy or economy, he is again confused, but still fits in what he sees to his conception of the place as a charitable institution.

Or, once more, if a visitor comes to stay for a few days, and gets into conversation with the residents, he will probably be surprised at the new knowledge he almost unconsciously acquires. He will, as he listens to some casual talk, shape for himself a new idea of what is done by guardians or vestrymen; he will discover the part which local government plays in life, and learn how trades unions, co-operative societies, and friendly societies are worked; he will get new light on clubs, and be set thinking about measures of reform and development. Further and more private talk with individuals will put him in possession of strange facts and figures, clothed in humanity by reason of the narrator's intimacy with the lives of his neighbours. He will feel the importance of such knowledge to all who speak, write, vote, or legislate. He will no longer wonder at mistakes in philanthropy or legislation while such ignorance exists as to the hopes and needs of the poor. He will go away thinking that Toynbee Hall is a sort of bureau of social information.

A Settlement as it is.

Toynbee Hall seems to its visitors to be a centre of education, a mission, a centre of social effort. It may be so; but the visitors miss the truth that the

place is a club house in Whitechapel occupied by men who do citizen's duty in the neighbourhood. The residents are not as a body concerned for education, teetotalism, poor relief, or any special or sectarian object. Each one leads his own life, earns his own living, and does his duty in his own way. Catholic, Churchman, Jew, Dissenter, and Agnostic, they live together and strengthen one another by what each contributes to the common opinion. There is no such thing as a "Toynbee Hall policy," and it is never true to say that "Toynbee Hall" favoured one candidate in an election, or that it stands for any special form of religion. A few men with their own bread to earn, with their own lives to enjoy, with their own sense of social debt, come to live together. No one surrenders what he has found to be good for his own growth; each man pursues his own vocation and keeps the environment of a cultured life. There is no affectation of equality with neighbours by the adoption of mean or dirty habits. There is no appearance of sacrifice. The men live their own life in Whitechapel instead of in West London, and do—what is required of every citizen—a citizen's duties in their own neighbourhood. If those duties seem to a man to include the preaching of his own faith, he delivers his own soul and tells his gospel when he visits in a club or teaches in a class. There is no limit put on any form of earnestness so long as it is the man, and not the place, who is committed.

The same impulse which has created Settlements has led many men to take lodgings and alone or with one or two friends live in East London. They have thus found duties to their hands and made

links with their neighbours; but, notwithstanding striking examples of success, my present judgment favours the plan of a community. In a Settlement, no resident loses his individuality, but the criticism of his peers keeps up his standard of order and cleanliness, while it checks the development of fads and of sloth. A place like Toynbee Hall may offer what seems to be more comfort than is possible in East End lodgings, but it requires what is often a greater sacrifice—the surrender of self-will and of will-worship. Moreover, although no man loses his individuality in a Settlement, each is stronger as a member of a body in touch with many interests than as a lonely lodger; he gets strength by what his mates are, and he gives strength by what he is. In fact, true individuality survives, I think, better in a Settlement than in lodgings, where eccentricities are often cherished, and where useful conventions succumb to the influences of East London.

Toynbee Hall is not what it seems. Imitators who begin by building lecture-rooms and by starting schemes for education and relief, make the same mistake as those who followed our Lord because He made the sick man take up his bed, and not because He forgave sins. True imitation is when half a dozen men or women set on social service go and live among the poor. They may take a house or occupy a block in an artisans' dwelling, and they may begin without a subscription list or an advertisement. Out of their common life various activities will develop, and the needs they discover they will meet.

Toynbee Hall seems to be a centre of education, a mission, a polytechnic, another example of philanthropic machinery; it is really a club, and the

various activities have their root and their life in the individuality of its members.

Test of Settlement's Success.

It is as an effort of the human spirit to do human work that a Settlement must be judged. Its classes, its social schemes, are not so true a test of its success as its effect in establishing friendship between man and man.

If from this point of view I were asked what Toynbee Hall has done, I should answer: (1) It has tended to mitigate class suspicion; (2) it has helped to inspire local government with a higher spirit.

I. It has tended to mitigate class suspicion. East London and West London suspect each other. The poor, when they hear of a rich man's philanthropy, say, "Does he serve God for naught?" They reckon up the activities of the clergy with the reflection that they work to make converts or for promotion, and they imagine that public men seek their votes in order to get place for themselves. The rich on their side suspect the poor: they are half afraid they may rebel; they think an act of politeness is a sort of begging; they see vindictive designs in their policy, and imagine that because they have no stake in the nation they have no common interests with themselves.

Toynbee Hall has puzzled its neighbours who had such opinions. For a long time all sorts of motives were put to its credit. "Wait a bit," it was said, "and the people who go there will be called to a prayer-meeting," or "You will see it is a dodge of Tories—of Liberals—of Socialists to get votes." It was five or six years after its opening that a speaker

at a meeting of a friendly society confessed that up to that time his society had held aloof, suspecting some design to steal from people their independence. Up to the present time many neighbours remain unconvinced, and any appearance of special sympathy at times of crisis would be sufficient to get the place classed as Tory or Radical, Church or Chapel.

But on the whole the policy of successive years has shaken old prejudices. When in the same house is found both a Moderate and a Progressive member of the London School Board, when one resident is known as a Tory and another as a Radical, when at the Dock Strike service was rendered and no credit taken, when at times of distress the place has not been used as a centre of relief, and when it is realised that the residents give their time from a sense of duty, the belief is encouraged that it is not to advance any party interest that the place is established. When, further, it is realised that earnest believers in different creeds work together in friendship—remain true to themselves and yet push towards the same ends—another idea of the meaning of religion is developed.

A shake has thus been given to the habit of suspicion; but, more than this, individual friendships have been formed, along which currents of good feeling run from class to class. At first men have met their neighbours as members of a committee; they have, perhaps, taken part in the administration of relief, or joined in a game at a club, or spoken in a debate. They have made acquaintance naturally on an equal footing, and in some cases acquaintance has ripened into friendship. Two men born in different circumstances, educated by different means,

occupied in different work, have in such meeting felt themselves akin. They have become friends and sharers in each other's strength. And because they are friends their eyes have been opened to see the good in their friend's friends. Poor men have seen that the rich are not what they are pictured by orators, and the rich have found that the poor have virtues not always expressed by their language.

There are few parties which have left happier memories than those at which some resident has received together friends made in the West and in the East. All the guests have felt at their ease. They have come with their different pasts and different hopes, but the common intimacy with their host provokes such trust that they enjoy their differences. Many are the testimonies received as to the pleasure experienced in forming acquaintances in a new class.

It would obviously be absurd to expect that twenty men living in Whitechapel should make any evident mark on the public opinion of half a million of people, but for my part I am convinced that, as a result of their settlement, there is an increase of good-will.

II. In the second place, I think Toynbee Hall has helped to inspire local government with a higher spirit. It is a true instinct which makes people distrust machinery, but it is obvious that if humanity is to operate effectively in raising society it must be by means of organisations and officials. Local government is in East London the most effective of such organisations, and is gradually absorbing many of the functions of the Church and of charity. It more and more has under its care the schools of the children and the classes

of the adults; it provides for health and recreation, for the relief of the weak and the training of the strong. School managers are making the Public Schools delightful by the new interests they introduce. District Councils secure health by means of clean streets and sound houses; they open spaces, build libraries, and put public halls within easy reach of their constituents. Guardians are making their infirmaries model hospitals, their workhouses training homes, and their methods of relief a stimulus to exertion. People who are weary with the competition of charities, with the constant appeals and advertisements, turn with relief to the municipal system. They are pained by the quarrels of Church and Dissent, by the exaggeration and depreciation of efforts, and they more and more depend on Boards and Councils. Local government is, indeed, the hope of East London, but the hope grows faint under pressure of the thought that East Londoners are too busy or too crushed to serve on Boards and Councils.

No one lives in East London of his own will. Its inhabitants are either striving to move out of it or unable to do so. The wonder, indeed, is that local government is as good as it is. But it is not good, and in some cases it is bad. It is often wanting in knowledge, and is therefore unconscious of abuses which would not be endured in West London; it rarely understands economy—the economy of wise expenditure or of business control—and it is wanting in the public spirit which breaks from old traditions. The faults are accidental, not inherent. If the abuses of smells, smoke, dirt, and noise are pointed out, they are recognised; if the needs of the people are put alongside of the old customs of the Board,

they are often allowed ; if some one appears who has knowledge of accounts, and shows faith in his policy, his lead is accepted.

Local government in East London needs the presence of a few people who will formulate its mission. To some degree this has been done by the residents of Toynbee Hall. Some of them as members of Boards, all of them as neighbours, have shown something of what is not done and of what might be done. Whitechapel has been moved to get a library ; political parties have been induced to adopt a social programme ; the police have been encouraged to enforce order in back streets.

A new spirit is moving over local government. It is obviously impossible to put its presence to the credit of Toynbee Hall ; but it is fair to say that its residents have contributed by the share they have actively taken as members of various Boards, as well as by the influence they have exerted. What is still wanting to the efficiency of the Boards is the business power which understands economy. Grants in aid of rates have developed a policy which doles always develop. Local legislators become more concerned in getting money to spend than in economical management. If business men, with the capacity which has created great private establishments, would come as residents, they might make local government strong enough to prevent some threatened evils.

A Settlement, by bringing into a neighbourhood people whose training makes them sensible to abuses, and whose humanity makes them conscious of other needs, does what machinery as machinery cannot do. It fits supply and demand, it adapts itself to changing circumstances, it yields and goes forward,

it follows or guides, according to the moment's need; it turns an organisation which might be a mere machine into a living human force. Above all, it brings men into touch with men, and, by making them fuller characters, enriches their work.

Thus up to a degree, taking Toynbee Hall as an example, Settlements have put something human alongside the necessary machinery. But the end is far off; Settlements are too few, and they have too often yielded to the temptation to rival other organisations with a show of their works.

It is a surprise to some of us that Settlements are so few, and the question is sometimes asked whether it is because the life is so interesting that it appeals to no sense of sacrifice, or whether it is because the sacrifice of leaving "a West End society" is too great.

I have written this paper believing in neither of these reasons, but believing rather that men do not understand the meaning of a Settlement.

There is as much good-will to-day as there was in 1883, and there is more knowledge. Men and women, conscious of others needs, are more conscious that machinery fails. They are anxious to avert the ills which threaten society, and are ready themselves to do their part. It is because Settlements seem to be "a fad"—an experiment of "cranks"—or another mechanical invention, that they keep aloof.

I have, therefore, written this paper to show that a Settlement is simply a means by which men or women may share themselves with their neighbours; a club-house in an industrial district, where the condition of membership is the performance of a citizen's duty; a house among the poor, where the residents may make friends with the poor.

1895.

"SETTLEMENTS" OR "MISSIONS"

THE way of "Settlements" in meeting social needs is much followed. Every year new Settlements are started. In many of the great American cities, in Berlin, Amsterdam, and Paris, the name has become more or less familiar. Most observers of the fact regard the Settlement as a sort of Mission—another form of the proselytising spirit—a rival of other converting agencies to be approved or condemned as something either better or worse. That they make a mistake in thus confounding two distinct efforts it is the aim of this paper to show.

Observers of 1897 are conscious for the moment of social quiet, and not, as formerly, of social unrest. Problems about rich and poor no longer knock at the door demanding instant solution. A cold spell has followed the hot interest of other years. Agitators get little response when appealing either to the indignation of sufferers or to the enthusiasm of the generous-hearted. A philosophy of rights rather than of duties is professed, and it is expected that every man will take care of himself and look after what he has got. The sense of "things unseen" seems less strong and the sense of common brotherhood less passionate.

The reasons for the change are many and difficult of enumeration. There is first of all the reaction after the excited hopes that a socialistic heaven would at once appear—a reaction in which cynicism makes people sceptical of promises and disinclined to public effort. There is also the revival of trade, which has given employment to many hands, and for the moment removed farther off that haunting fear of starvation or the workhouse which fills the social atmosphere with spectres and demons, and makes the people ready for riot or panic. And following the greater prosperity there is a more determined set on pleasure, a natural inclination to have a "good time" with a sort of impatience of hampering restrictions. "Why should we not spend our savings? let us eat and drink." "Why should we be limited by old-fashioned and Puritan laws? let us have our music-hall promenades; let us enjoy the plays the French enjoy." "Why should we be troubled by thinking, or concern ourselves as to how the next generation will get on or how our neighbours live? We have had trouble enough; let us take our pleasure." This is a spendthrift generation.

Such are some of the reasons for the social quiet of 1897—reasons disturbing to those who are disposed to be thankful for the quiet, and sufficient to open the eyes of many to the delusive character of the quiet. The foundation is of shifting sand, and the house of social peace must be built on the rock of mutual respect and of common duty.

There is not this mutual respect, and the social problem is still unsolved. Master and man are competitors and not co-operators, each is on the

watch to deal the other a blow, and their respective organs breathe insolence and insult. The poor do not live out half their days; "in a blacker incessanter line" they crowd to the workhouses, and in Jubilee week 300,000 in London were willing to call themselves "outcasts" that they might eat a meal at a stranger's hand. The unemployed have hardly shared in the good trade of the time; they tramp the country, mocking the promises of the fair hedgerows as with hunted eyes they scowl at happier passengers; they lie all night in the corners of the doorways of the rich man's offices—a skeleton at their feasts too common to be noticed—and they haunt like spectres the army of progress.

The social question remains the question of questions. The forces which more than any other are powerful to create or to destroy are still unordered. The people may be quiet, but it is because they are tired or drugged and not because they are healthy. They may again, as they have in the past, break up the pleasant places created by a trade justified by success more than by principle, and destroy the political stage on which the imperial play has been acted in the eyes of the world.

There may be social quiet, but there is not social peace. The classes are out of joint and do not work together to one end. The call is still for a way of peace, and for a means of promoting good fellowship between man and man.

Two ways of leading to the desired end are open to University men—a designation not to be narrowly interpreted, but meant to include all those who have shared the best educational gifts of the age. These are the way of Missions and the way of Settlements.

By the uninformed the two may be, and often are, taken to be identical, or there is, perhaps, a vague idea that a Mission is conducted on lines rather more religious or "churchy" than those of a Settlement. The two are in fact distinct efforts: differing in conception, in constitution, and in methods, and agreeing only in their object, which is for the good of mankind. Differing internally, they differ also in their appropriateness to special times and phases of thought. A Mission is strongest during an agitated time, when men's minds are open to new impressions and ready to turn in a new direction and to give up old habits and ways; a Settlement is equally effective in a time of quiet like the present, and feels its strength to be in the gradual infusion of higher thought, the slow gaining of confidence and of mutual respect between rich and poor who have learnt to be friends.

Missions.

The way of Missions is well understood. They who join them believe in some doctrines or methods which they wish to extend. It may be those of Church or Chapel, those of teetotalers or Socialists, but it is always for some definite end that followers are enlisted, energies organised, and machinery created. A Mission exists to proselytise, and as such has been and will be effective. It is indeed the necessary outlet for the waves of enthusiasm which are raised as first one idea and then another idea sweeps over the minds of men. They who have a vision of a Church holding all souls in its grasp and offering them to God, are bound to have Missions whose object is the extension of Churc

principles, just as those who have an idea of society ordered under the State, or of individuals made sober by Acts of Parliament, or of a government by the people, are bound to have Socialist, Temperance, and Liberal Missions. There will be Missions as long as believers in what seems good desire that others should share that belief. Better a thousand mistaken Missions than that this desire should fail! Far be it from me at any rate to depreciate Missions. As a minister of the Church of England I am concerned that its teaching shall be accepted, and as a member of a political party I am anxious that the principles of that party shall become general. As long as men are capable of clear thought they will have distinct views as to what is best, and as long as they have warm hearts they will desire that others adopt their own views. It is human for man to leave other pursuits to become fishers of men. There will always, therefore, be organisations, secular or religious, which will be distinctly missionary, and adapted by all means to the spread of definite doctrines or methods of living.

Settlements.

But a Settlement is not a Mission in this sense. It is a club, a community of "University" men or women established in an industrial district. It is a brotherhood in which the members may or may not be of one creed or one political party. It is a college where the study is the neighbour and the neighbourhood. The two ways may be put in a set of antitheses—

A Mission has for its object conversion.

A Settlement has for its object mutual knowledge.

A Mission creates organisations, institutions, and machinery.

A Settlement uses personal influence and tends to human contact.

The object of this paper is to show

THE ADVANTAGES OF THE WAY OF SETTLEMENTS

The perennial danger in society is the development within its limits of opposing and exclusive interests. The sources of English strength lies, as an Indian student once remarked, in the English power of association. All parties and classes have kept their differences subordinate to the common end, and at times of crises, Protestants and Catholics, Liberals and Tories, have stood side by side. In these latter days, however, instead of the old parties, it is Labour and Capital which divide the country, and the anxiety of the moment is whether these will also in times of crises think more of the common good than of their private interest.

Disraeli long ago saw the possibility of what he called "two nations"—one, that of the rich, and the other, that of the poor—in England, and signs of their creation are not wanting. There is for the rich as for the poor a code of manners which each is inclined to assert—a habit of dress, for instance, which, whether it be represented by cloth cap or silk hat, by dress clothes or morning coat, is by each side regarded as a sort of banner not to be struck at any instance. There is, too, a growing divergence of language and tastes as those educated in like surroundings more and more associate together. The workman who has his own club and his own organs is no longer driven to try and under-

stand what is said by others differently situated, or to read papers addressed to other classes. He is as impatient of what he does not at once understand, as the employer is impatient of what he thinks to be ignorance. He has his jokes in which the cultured are caricatured for his amusement, as in Phil May's drawings the poor have been caricatured for the amusement of the rich. These and many such signs of a sort of "national sense" might be quoted, and lately the passionate "nationalism," the conviction of right in the fight for rights, which has always been a strength to the Labour party, seems to have entered also the "Capital" party.

But without dwelling on this point, it is clear that if one class lives by itself, acquires customs of its own and thoughts of its own, develops a sense of the righteousness of its cause, if it judges of other classes by means of tales told to arouse a pitiful sympathy, or by plays written so as to appeal to popular prejudices—if each class tends to think more of its own interests than of common interests, then the unity of society is impossible. And without this unity England can neither survive at home nor rule abroad.

Most important is it therefor to bring together the members of various classes on platforms where in some human fellowship they will realise their kinship. Warfare comes of misunderstanding. Prejudices about another's political or social views may melt in the warmth roused in talk about scientific progress or in a common effort for a neighbour's good. Two honest opponents will hardly discuss together on neutral subjects without learning something of each other which will cause the substitution of respect for contempt.

The Advantage to the Rich.

A body of men or women who in their own homes, or at some centre of education, have received the best gifts of the time, take up their residence in the industrial quarter of a great town. They bring with them the manners and habits they have acquired, and they proceed to follow their career in exactly the same way as if they resided in any other quarter. They have their pictures, their books, the various refinements which are directed by order and cleanliness. They go to and fro to their business and by visits or hospitality keep old friendships in repair. There is no affectation of asceticism, and no appearance of trying "to do others good." But in their comings and goings they pass through mean streets; they become familiar with the faces who throng such streets; they take note of neglect which lets dirt accumulate and disorder grow, and they get every day new thoughts from the sight of children's play and children's work. When as time goes on, and in fulfilment of their duty as citizens, they join in the public duties of the neighbourhood, their knowledge becomes more intimate. As members of a local Board they learn what law can do and cannot do; as managers of a school they discover how delusive is the appearance of a system; on relief committees they come face to face with that very complicated disease called "poverty"; and in workmen's clubs they realise how narrow are the limits in which the majority of their neighbours find pleasure. In all these capacities they show an interest hardly possible for residents in another quarter of the town,

and they form friendships with individuals which are cemented by casual meetings in the streets or by exchange of visits.

The member of the public Board learns the point of view of the official when he has had some walks and talks with the sanitary officer or relieving officer, or over a tea-table learnt from the nurse the tale of her work. The school manager has quite another view of the education system since he travelled, botanised, and exchanged visits with the teachers, helped to form school clubs among the children, and heard in his own room the complaint of the parent. The member of the relief committee is both sterner and more tender now that he has become familiar with the home of the applicants, and knows something of the children. The club-mate has become alive to the fact that laughter does not always mean enjoyment, and that the pleasures sought are not those wanted, ever since, in more intimate talk and in the privacy of his own room, he has got at the innermost mind of his mates.

By these and by a hundred other means open to intelligent and human men and women, the residents in a Settlement learn what are the interests of working people, what their opinions, what their order of thought, what their language. Their minds are changed by the atmosphere they breathe. They take in knowledge which they do not tabulate; they absorb thought as air; they unconsciously become sympathetic, and lose the narrow views which kept them as a class apart.

A Settlement enables the rich to know the poor in a way not possible for a Mission, whose members

go about with minds set on their object, and who are often held at a distance because of that object. Teetotalers, for instance, anxious to increase the numbers of their own society, have minds hardly free enough to rise and fall with the mind of a neighbour anxious about a hundred other things, while the neighbours themselves will think they have accounted for every kind act of a teetotaler when they say "He does it all to get converts." Residents in a Settlement, on the other hand, having their own work to do, and living as neighbours rather than as missionaries, will approach those neighbours by some of the hundred by-ways which are formed between those whose lives lie alongside one another. They will be trusted just in so far as their humanity is felt, and will be neither sought nor avoided on account of any message they bring. They will thus gain a knowledge of the working classes which is often more rare in their own class than that of foreigners among whom they travel and make friendships.

The knowledge, as it extends, will have many results. It will check the ill-directed charity which, springing out of goodwill, is nevertheless, because of the gross ignorance about the poor, corrupting and provocative of anger. It will affect the decisions of magistrates who are often lenient, excusing neglect of school and forgiving some excess when, if they had known what law means to the weak, they would have been severe; and who are often severe, condemning perhaps some abuse of property, when, if they had known the temptation, they would have been lenient. It will alter the character of legislation, which, often adopted with intention to remove some

grievance or establish some good, remains a dead letter for want of knowledge of the conditions in which the law will be administered. It will make religious teachers reconsider their methods and their language, both of which are now frequently not comprehended by a people who, absorbing the reasoning spirit of the age, have a phraseology of their own. But most important of all: as the knowledge of their neighbours extends among the richer classes the sense of division will give place to that of oneness. Friendships are the true links of society. If Jones of Cambridge and Smith of Whitechapel know one another, Jones thinks more fairly of all workmen and Smith of all richer men. Theorists may talk of divided interests, but by the convincing evidence of feeling they know that they belong to one another.

Residents in a Settlement gather not only the knowledge which will make them better able to direct charity and legislation, they learn to sympathise with their new neighbours, and by the sacred avenue of fellow-feeling enter into the meaning of aspirations now often warped in their expression. They shrink from the popular tales which, to arouse the pity of a few, degrade humanity; they rebel at the hasty generalisations which sum up a Trades Union policy in a phrase; and they resent as libels many of the descriptions of the poor. They know that the workman's demands do not always represent his wants, and that his faults are other than they seem. They realise what is meant by a lifetime of work which does not interest the worker—by the consciousness of brain power without brain food; they feel for the

deformed faculties and the perverted faith which admires false idols and turns on old leaders.

They may not always agree with their neighbours, or take their view of politics, but they will disagree as those who belong to the same body and not as occupants of opposite camps. It is common neighbourhood, frequent meetings, casual intercourse, kindred interests, memories of shared joy or sorrow, hearthside talks, the knowledge of one another's homes, that establish such sympathy, and when established the richer residents and their poorer neighbours can no longer think of themselves as of two nations. Settlements, therefore, may be said to be of advantage to the rich in abolishing class antagonism—in awakening the belief in a common brotherhood as a practical reality and not as a dreamer's theory.

The Advantage to the Poor.

Labour and Capital are, it has been suggested, the two forces which divide modern society. The zeal for education represents the conviction that these forces must be brought into union. If Capital is educated and Labour ignorant, the gulf will be almost impassable; and yet with all the talk about schools, polytechnics, and classes, such threatens to be the case. On the side of Capital, speaking generally, are those who think clearly, whose pleasures are varied, whose solitude is refreshed by the sights seen by the inward eye, whose ways are refined, and into whose knowledge have entered those conceptions of God revealed to this present time. On the other side, that of Labour, is the majority; they have the same ability to enjoy and to think, but they have not the

means. They take rhetoric dressed up into arguments as if it were logic, their reading is limited for the most part to "bits" and "scraps"; they have few subjects for thought or for talk, little ambition to enjoy, and little solace from philosophy or religion.

On one side of the gulf stand the Pharisees—the richer classes—thanking God that they read much and wash daily; and on the other side are the Publicans—the working people—priding themselves that they are not as those Pharisees.

The antagonism which is thus threatened is dangerous, and a wise instinct creates the present anxiety about education. The State and voluntary bodies are alike concerned to teach higher and lower subjects, they have their technical and commercial schools, their polytechnics and extension schemes. But in one direction every system fails. "Culture," it is said, "comes by contact." Teachers and lecturers may tell everything which can be told of their subjects; the schoolrooms and lecture-halls may be fitted with books and pictures to suggest thought and taste; the best system of study may be adopted, but if the students and children have not known as friends people possessed of knowledge, and been familiar with homes brightened by the light of knowledge, they will not understand. Every one must have been struck over and over again by the greater mental possessions of a child brought up among educated people than those of a better-taught child brought up out of touch with educated people. "A Christian life," we are often told, "is more effective to make heathens Christians than much argument," and we know that it was not until His Son lived in the world

that man understood what the Law and prophets had taught about God.

Every sort of machinery—much more than is at present in use—must be applied to do away with the ignorance which divides society, but residents in a Settlement may do what no machinery can do. As they make friends with their neighbours, and welcome them in their rooms, and spend evenings in familiar talk, they will commend the ways of education for getting pleasure. As they take part with them in local business—bring to bear on some present question the experience of the past, or clear away the mist of words in which reason is enveloped, they will show the value of knowledge. As they do their duty, giving up their own will to keep engagements, putting aside their own pleasure to give others pleasure, they will give the lie to that most paralysing and most common of heresies, "no one serves God for naught."

By frequent meetings—by the mere fact of neighbourhood—the habits and the refinements of the few become common. The best manners no longer remain the badge of a class but the pride of all. Every one probably absorbs unconsciously more than he learns consciously, and it is in the atmosphere which educated people create, or under the influence which floats about the words of educated men, that Labour will acquire the knowledge to make it at one with Capital. A Settlement, therefore, as distinguished from a Mission, extends knowledge by trusting to the lives of residents who may have many opposite opinions and various tastes. It is useful to the poor because the education which is common to the holders of opposite opinions is that which they

need rather than any definite information. It tends to create among them a sense of unity with other classes as unconsciously they grow to enjoy what experience has proved to be best. A sense of unity—like other good things—wears better when it comes unconsciously.

The Value of a Common Life.

Missionaries sometimes yield to the influences they go to counteract. Men and women who have gone as individuals to live among the poor with a view to raising their habits to be more on a level with those found to be best for society and for health, have themselves fallen below that level. They have become untidy, less regardful of dress by which to signify their respect of others and of themselves, less scrupulous as to the cleanliness which is recognised as the best safeguard of health, less careful of courtesy which is necessary to equal intercourse. A missionary, be it even a clergyman, in a poor neighbourhood, is liable to become conscious of superiority, and will show it as much in the neglect of ordinary conventionalities as in his way of speaking to his neighbours. Life in a community of equals, such as constitutes a Settlement, tends to correct this tendency. A standard of manners and habits is kept up, and every form of conceit is checked. The healthy criticism of comrades who agree in object but differ in method is a constant corrective. Liberals and Tories, Churchmen and Dissenters, Socialists and Individualists, who recognise one another as jointly concerned for the improvement of their neighbourhood, grow by one another's strength.

And even—as is the case in some Settlements—if it be made a condition of residence that there shall be a profession of religious or political denomination, this does not imply that each resident will devote himself to forwarding the interests of that denomination. The condition is one designed for the apparent advantage of those living together, and not to prevent the free development of different ways of living and the free expression of healthy criticism. A Settlement must always include strong individualities with differing views on many subjects.

The Need of Distinction between Settlements and Missions.

Missions—as it has been stated—have their place in the social economy and their advantages. They have, however, their disadvantages: they do not enlist the sympathies of those many "University" men and women who want to serve their neighbours without specialising themselves, and they do not command the ready ear of those many working people who think, when they have heard its name, they know all about the object of the Mission.

A Settlement's distinguishing feature is the absence of programme, and the presence of men and women who recognise the obligations of citizenship.

It is to be regretted if because the way of Settlements has some vogue the name should be given to efforts which are more properly Missions. If it is connected with the work of any religious or social reforming agency, there will no longer seem to be a way open for those who, without wishing to deny the use of such agencies, are not assured of any method, but wish themselves to be learners. If

some good man making himself the centre of social efforts calls himself a "Settlement," the neighbours will soon expect all Settlements to be part of the philanthropic machinery, the usual hangers-on of that machinery will gather, and the majority of the working people will hold aloof.

The tendency of human nature is, we know, to follow the line of least resistance, and although it may seem an easy matter to join a pleasant community of equals who live in some "East End," it involves a good deal more, both of effort and of patience, than the support of a Mission. It needs some effort of will to break away from the convention which requires a man to live where most of his class live, or for a woman to leave home duties, even when there are others to perform those duties. It takes strength to be original even in such a small matter as the choice of residence. And if it needs an effort of will to give up "West End" conventions, it needs also an effort of patience to go in the faith that the Spirit is more than power or might, that the influence of a life is of more value than sermons or institutions—that it is living more than doing which changes the habits of mankind.

Because of this call on an effort of will and of patience, there is danger that the way of Settlements will not be strictly kept and the way of Missions will be substituted. This paper is intended to be a reminder of the distinctions, and to show to "University" men and women that if they will live among working people and share their gifts, they may hope to increase peace and good-will.

A Settlement is not an institution asking support, it is the means by which those conscious of social

debt may equip themselves with the knowledge as to how their neighbours live—very corrective of many class prejudices. Those who use these means may, indeed, at the same time give to their neighbours the knowledge of other habits of living, very refreshing to them. Settlements exist simply to enable rich and poor to understand one another. Their success will be proved when they are unnecessary.

1897.

PART IV

RECREATION

PRINCIPLES OF RECREATION

A PEOPLE'S play is a fair test of a people's character. Their recreation more than their business or their conquests settle the nations' place in history. Men and women, in their hours of leisure, show their real admiration and their inner faith. Their "idle words," in more than one sense, are those by which they are judged.

No one who has reached an age from which he can overlook fifteen or twenty years can doubt but that pleasure-seeking has greatly increased. The railway statistics show that during the last year more people have been taken to seaside and pleasure resorts than ever before. On Bank Holidays a larger number travel, and more and more facilities are annually offered for day trips and evening entertainments. New music-halls are opened, and most of the suburbs of large towns are now provided with their theatres, their halls of varieties, or other places of public entertainment.

The newspapers give many pages to recording games, pages which are eagerly scanned even when, as in the case of the *Daily News*, the betting on

their results is omitted. Crowds, numbered by thousands and tens of thousands, go to witness, and often pay to witness, races, football and cricket matches; while golf, tennis, badminton, cards, and croquet occupy a place in the minds of the more cultivated classes which our fathers and grandfathers would hardly have credited had it been prophesied to them.

Face to face with these facts we need some principles to enable us to advise this pleasure-seeking generation what to seek and what to avoid.

Concerning the taking of pleasure the Bible gives us no guide. On this matter, so momentous to us, Christ, our Master, is silent. It was not before Him, and He had no need to discourse on it; but it is a twentieth-century problem which His Church has to face, and one which we, humbly walking after Him, must try and solve in His Spirit.

To arrive at principles one has to probe below the surface, to seek the cause of the pleasure given by various amusements. Briefly, what persons of all ages seek in pleasure is (1) excitement, (2) interest, (3) memories. These are natural desires; no amount of preaching or scolding or hiding them away will abolish them. It is the part of wisdom to recognise facts and use them for the uplifting of human nature.

May I offer two principles for consideration?

I. Pleasure, while offering excitement, should not depend on excitement; it should not involve a fellow-creature's loss or pain, nor lay its foundation on greed or gain.

II. Pleasure should not only give enjoyment, it should also increase capacities for enjoyment. It

should strengthen a man's whole being, enrich memory, and call forth effort.

If these principles have a basis of truth, the questions arise, "Are the common recreations of our people such as to encourage our hope of English progress?" "Do they make us proud of the growth of national character, and give us a ground of security for the high place we all long that England shall hold in the future?" The country may be lost as well as won on her playing-fields.

The recreations of the rich are found in racing, hunting, shooting, fishing, yachting, card-playing, showing their possessions (which includes clothing), sun-seeking, play-going, motoring, dancing, and eating. The recreations of the less educated classes are found in races, football matches, music-halls, beach shows, roundabout or switchback movements, sex-romping, and drinking. All involve, in a greater or less degree, the necessary excitement.

Recreation means the refreshment of the sources of life. Routine wears life, and "it is life of which our nerves are scant." The excitement which stirs the worn or sleeping centres of a man's body, mind, or spirit is the first step in such refreshment, but followed by nothing else it defeats its own end. It uses strength and creates nothing, and if unmixed with what endures it can but leave the partaker the poorer. The fire must be stirred, but unless fuel be supplied the flames will soon sink in ashes.

It behoves us, then, to accept excitement as a necessary part of recreation, and to seek to add to it those things which lead to increased resources and leave purer memories. Such an addition is skill. A wise manager of a boys' refuge once said

to me that it was the first step upwards to induce a lad to play a game of skill instead of a game of chance. Another such addition is co-operation, that is, a call on the receiver to give something. It is better, for instance, to play a game than to watch a game, to sympathise with a drama than to gaze at a spectacle. It may perhaps be helpful to recall the principle, and let it test some of the popular pleasures.

Pleasure, while offering excitement, should not depend on excitement; it should not involve a fellow-creature's loss or pain, nor lay its foundation on greed or gain.

This principle excludes the recreations which, like drink or gambling, stir without feeding, or the pleasures which are blended with the sorrows of the meanest thing that feels. It excludes also the dull museum which feeds without stirring, and makes no provision for excitement. Tried by this standard, what is to be said of Margate, Blackpool, and such *popular resorts*, with their ribald gaiety and inane beach shows? Of *Music Halls*, where the entertainment was recently described by Mr. Stead as the "most insufferable banality and imbecility that ever fell upon human ears," disgusting him not so much for its immorality as by the vulgar stupidity of it all. Of *racing*, the acknowledged interest of which is in the betting, a method of self-enrichment by another's impoverishment which tends to sap the very foundations of honesty and integrity; of *football matches*, which thousands watch, often ignorant of the science of the game, but captivated by the hope of winning a bet or by the spectacle of brutal conflict; of *monster school*

treats or excursions, when numbers engender such monopolising excitement that all else which the energetic curate or the good ladies have provided is ruthlessly swallowed up; *shooting battues*, where skill and effort gives place to organisation and cruelty; of *plays*, where the interest centres round the breaking of the commandments and "fools make a mock of sin."

Such pleasures may amuse for the time, but they fail to be recreative in so far as they do not make life fuller, do not increase powers of admiration, hope, and love; do not store the memory to be "the bliss of solitude." Of most of them it can be safely foretold that the "crime of sense will be avenged by sense which wears with time." Such pleasures cannot lay the foundation for a glad old age. Does this sound as if all popular pleasures are to be condemned? No! brought to the test of our second principle, there are whole realms of pleasure-land which the Christian can explore and introduce to others to the gladdening, deepening, and strengthening of their lives. May I reiterate the principle?

Pleasure should not only give enjoyment, it should also increase the capacities for enjoyment. It should strengthen a man's whole being, enrich memory, and call forth effort or co-operation.

Plays profound enough to call for the co-operation of heart and mind—music, games of skill, books, athletics, foreign travel, cycling, walking tours, sailing, photography, picture galleries, botanical rambles, antiquarian researches, and many others too numerous to mention. Such recreations call out the growth of the powers, as well as feed what

exists; they excite active not only passive emotions; they enlist the receiver as a co-operator; they allow the pleasure-seekers to feel in themselves the joy of being creators, children of a creating God.

As we consider the subject, the chasm between right and wrong pleasures, worthy and unworthy recreations, seems to become deeper and broader, often though crossed by bridges of human effort, triumphs of dexterity, evidences of skill wrought by patient practice, which though calling for no thought in the spectator yet rouses his admiration, and provides standards of executive excellence, albeit directed in regrettable channels.

Still broadly, recreations may be divided between those which call for effort, and therefore make towards progress, and those which breed idleness and its litter of evils; but (and this in the inherent difficulty for reformers) the mass of the people, rich and poor alike, will not make efforts, and as the *Times* so admirably put it the other day, "They preach to each other the gospel of idleness and call it the gospel of recreation."

The mass, however, is our concern. Those idle rich, who seek their stimulus in competitive expenditure; those ignorant poor, who turn for their pleasure to examples of brute force; those destructive classes, whose delight is in slaying or in eliminating space; they are all alike in being content to be "Vacant of our glorious gains, satisfied with lower pleasures and lower pains."

What can the clergymen and the clergy women do? It is not easy to reply, but there are some things they need not do. They need not promote monster treats, they need not mistake excitement

for pleasure, and call their day's outing "a huge success," because it was accompanied by much noise and the aimless running hither and thither of excited children; they need not use their institutes and schoolrooms to compete with the professional entertainer, and feel a glow of satisfaction because a low programme and a low price resulted in a full room; they need not accept the people's standards for songs and recitations, and think they have "had a capital evening," when the third-rate song is clapped, or the comic reading or dramatic scene appreciated by vulgar minds. Oh! the waste of curates' time and brain in such "parish work." "How often it has left me mourning!"

What the clergymen and women can do is to show the people that they have other powers within them for enjoyment, that effort promotes pleasure, and that the use of limbs with (not instead of) brains, and of imagination, can be made sources of joy for themselves and refreshment for others. Too often toys, playthings, or appliances of one sort or another are considered necessary for pleasure both by the young and the mature. Might not the clergy concentrate their efforts to provide recreation on those methods which show how people can *enjoy themselves*, their own powers and capacities? Such powers need cultivation as much as the powers of bread winning, and they include observation and criticism. "What did you think of it?" should be asked more frequently than "How did you like it?" The curiosity of children (so often wearying to their elders) is a natural quality which might be directed to observation of the wonders of nature, and to the conclusion of a story other than its author conceived.

"From change to change unceasingly, the soul's wings never furled," wrote Browning, and change brings food and growth to the soul, but the limits of interest must be extended to allow of the flight of the soul, and interests are often, in all classes, woefully restricted. It is no change for a blind man to be taken to a new view. Christ had to open the eyes of the blind before they could see God's fair world, and in a lesser degree we are saviours if we open the eyes of the born blind to see the hidden glories lying unimagined in man and nature. In friendship also there are sources of recreation which the clergy could do much to foster and strengthen, and the introduction and opportunities which allow of the cultivation of friendship between persons of all classes with a common interest, is peculiarly one which the clergy have opportunities to develop.

And last, but not least, there are the joys which come from the cultivation of a garden—joys which continue all the year round, and which can be shared by every member of the family of every age. These might be more widely spread in town as well as country. Municipalities, Boards of Guardians, school managers, and private owners often have the control both of people and land. If the Church would influence them, more children and more grown-ups might get health and pleasure on the land. I must not now entrench on the subject of Garden Cities, but the two subjects can be linked together inasmuch as the purest, deepest, and most recreative of pleasures can be found in the gardens which are the distinctive feature of the new cities and suburbs.

I would also venture to suggest that the clergy

should go and see popular amusements for themselves. I suppose 75 per cent. of every congregation gathered on Sunday have been to some place of amusement during the week. How useful and inspiriting it would be if the preacher would guide thought and uplift taste on what has occupied their time instead of preaching on some matter whose interest is bedimmed by centuries. On the third Sunday in August this year, in the height of the holiday season, I heard a sermon, from a cultivated man, on St. Paul's list of greetings in the Epistle to the Romans. What had it to do, even faintly, with the Hall by the sea, with the delights of the town dweller on moor and field, on rock or pools, with the indecent songs rendered at the pier-head before young and respectable people who had come there to enjoy the evening? If the clergy would go to see the people's pleasures they would yearn more over their erring flocks and talk more on present-day subjects. Take horse-racing, for instance. Who can defend it? Who can find one good result of it and its incalculable evils of betting, lying, cheating, drinking? Yet the Church is strangely loth to condemn it! Is it because the King (God bless him for his love of peace!) encourages the Turf? The King has again and again shown his care for his people's good, and maybe he would modify his actions—and the world would follow his lead—if the Church would speak out and condemn this baneful national pleasure.

It is not for me to preach to the clergy, but they have so often preached to me to my edification, that I would in gratitude give them in return an exhortation, and so I beg good men to give more

thought to the people's pleasures, to go and see them fearlessly, to study them in the hope of finding the valuable within the evil ugly exterior (as Christ found the white teeth in the stinking dog), and then give guidance from the pulpit and in the Press concerning them. Do not let them scold us because some of our pleasures (say motoring) annoy them, but let them believe that we, the laymen and women, want to be good, want to live the higher life, want to take joy without giving pain or corrupting character, and that what we demand of the clergy, is not to do so much for our parish pleasures, as to show us how to think rightly, feel deeply, and choose the noblest, for even non-church goers "needs must choose the highest when they see it."

1906.

HOLIDAY REFORM

HOLIDAYS, like the gratitude of men, often leave observers mourning. They have been secured by such efforts, they have been waited for with such expectations—and yet how sad and depressing often seem the holidays of the poor!

My duty during one summer called me almost daily to pass an open space near a group of crowded houses. Children can never be uninteresting, and day after day there were scenes to touch thought with suggestions of what is lovable in human nature, but the children rarely gave signs that they were enjoying their holidays. The elder girls, often burdened with the care of an infant, sat apart, generally gossiping, sometimes running vaguely after one another or after an interfering boy. The elder boys, keeping themselves also apart, sometimes tried a game, but their stock was limited and uninspired—games hardly fill the hours of a long day. They soon became fractious, quarrelled among themselves, or set out on a career of mischief to excite the caretaker. The younger children were usually squatted in a group, which was disturbed every now and then by a scream or by a wild and aimless riot. There was rarely any real play going on, never a book, and the children looked dirty and untidy and tired of themselves.

The thought was borne on me how much

children's pleasant holidays depend on some one's service. A holiday is not just a period with nothing to do. If the parents are unable to suggest occupations for the day and plan something for the morning and something for the afternoon; if there is no grown-up friend to set out and look on at the play, or to tell tales, or to guide a walk, or to talk about what is going on, the hours are likely to go heavily.

The children of the poor have not this service of their elders, and so the children I saw were weary and uninterested. Many, indeed, of weariness left the grass of the open space to take their seats in the gutter, whence they could see the passing tramcars and listen to the dramas or tragedies which occur when many families are crowded into a small court.

The holidays of the children often left me mourning. Some visits to a popular seaside resort did not convince me that the holidays of grown-up people are more happy. There was the journey in a crowded train, the hurried walk amid dust and shouts to the beach, and then the crowding to watch the niggers or the tumblers, or one of the many sights which could be seen with more comfort in a town room.

The people seemed to be too excited for enjoyment. They pushed about on the watch for something to interest them, often turning their backs on the sea and breathing one another's breath. There were some more adventurous who sought the same sort of amusement on the pier, and some who went for a ride or a drive, but with the majority of visitors the prevailing idea seemed to be that a holiday was an opportunity for eating and

drinking. They thus spent the day till, wearied or excited, they dragged themselves to the train, only so far happy if they did not quarrel.

What, then, should be the direction of holiday reform? The obvious need is an object. Children of the richer classes plan their play and their excursions. The grown-ups who are educated in self-enjoyment have their travelling, their shooting, their visits, or their golf.

The poor, children or grown-ups, seldom have any object to which to give leisure hours.

The children do not as a rule know games, they are too ignorant of birds and flowers and animals to be interested in watching their ways; they have none of the resources which come from familiarity with pictures, or music, or literature. They have nothing to do on a holiday but to do nothing. They have no one, as I have said, to make their holidays for them; no one to serve their pleasures.

The grown-ups have no visits to pay; they have not the enterprise to travel; they do not care to see old churches or castles; there is nothing in Nature which is theirs, and very little in History. They know no reason for going into the country except to get air. Everything else they seek in holiday resorts they could get at home.

The chief thing necessary for a holiday is an object—some end to attract the thought, some pursuit to carry the seeker through the air to beauty, something to be gained which will make a memory to be the bliss of working hours. A party of men and boys will loaf and get riotous with nothing to do, but with a ball to kick, they will fall into order and enjoyment. So it is on a

holiday : there must be an object—some ball to kick —if holiday seekers are to be happy.

How may such objects be given ?

I. Children should be prepared for leisure with as much care as they are prepared for work. Great pains are taken that boys should learn some skill and that girls should do needlework, but surely as great pains should be taken that they may develop powers of self-amusement and others' amusement. Why should not the children of the poor be taught games? Their present school hours are only twenty-five hours a week, which leaves a large margin in which they might have holiday classes—classes for games, for looking at pictures of country life, for learning about things to be seen and things to be collected, for hearing about places of interest. At present school-house and playgrounds are empty on Saturdays. It would not, surely, be impossible to find teachers who would come on these days to give such classes, while the relief to the children and the parents of a refuge from the streets would be great.

It is a curious illustration of the way in which the experience of one class makes public opinion, that it is now so commonly held that school is bondage. The truth is that the ample space of the rooms, and their cleanliness, their order, and their comparative quiet, are a positive refreshment to the class of children who use them. Mrs. Humphry Ward has shown what a summer school may be, and it has often occurred to me that all elementary schools should be open during the three summer months with the same curriculum that was found so attractive. The children would then go on their

holidays when it was possible, and not, as is now frequently the case, take their own holidays as well as the school holiday. The teachers would, of course, get holidays as at present, or even for longer periods, as school is for them undoubtedly bondage.

This extension of the school year and the continuous use of the school buildings is, however, a big question; my present point is that by such classes as I have mentioned children might be prepared to enjoy their country holiday. An experiment in this direction has, indeed, already been made. Teachers have in some schools talked to their children about what to see in the country; they have shown them pictures, they have encouraged them to make simple collections or to write descriptions of scenes or subjects. The experiment has been successful, not just in getting from the children results, but in giving them holiday interests—an object for their walks.

II. Another reform which is possible is the abolition of monster day treats and a change in the system which allows to clerks holidays of weeks and to workmen holidays of days.

First as to the monster day treats. Every one knows how they are organised by Churches and Chapels and societies. They are, indeed, recognised methods of advertisement which make their promoters known far and wide. The children are seen crowded in the long procession of vans or in the excursion train, and their voices are heard as they shout songs in all sorts of discord. Passers-by take the noise for happiness, but if they follow the children to their destination, taste the heavy food which has been carried from London, note the wild running to

and fro, the failing efforts of the teachers to provide amusement, the weariness of some children and the excitement of others, they will be more doubtful; and if they ask next day the teachers in the various schools or the more self-respecting of the parents, they will be told that the day has disturbed the children in body and mind.

There is no necessity for such day treats. The children might be taken in small parties of fifteen or twenty. They could then in a real sense share their teachers' attention; they could go to see something or do something which they could remember, and receive hospitality to arouse gratitude. Some of the saddest days in my experience have been days when I have laboured in vain with a crowd of would-be holiday-takers and have returned disgusted with the noise, the disorder, and the dissatisfaction of the guests. But the sad experience is balanced by the experience of many other days when, with a party of twenty neighbours, we have enjoyed the hospitality of a country friend, played our games together, visited gardens, listened to music, and taken our food amid the dainty preparations which have given dinner or tea a new charm.

And better than any day treats are the fortnight country visits organised by the Country Holidays Fund. Children for 5s. a week each, and grown-ups for 7s. or 10s. a week each, are sent by these funds as visitors to country cottages, where the interest of their host's life becomes itself an object. They listen to talk about subjects strange to town ears, and they get a sense of the quiet of the country impossible amid a crowd. If, as has been suggested, they have been prepared for their holiday, then in

games, or in collecting, or in visiting places of interest they have the material for a happy holiday.

And as to the change in the system of holidays which would substitute a week for odd days, it seems to need but a little thought on the part of employers and trade unions to make the change. Many workmen, we are told on all sides, take in days more holidays than clerks take in weeks. This can neither be good for their work nor for themselves. The employers' calculations are upset, and fellow-workmen are put out when a Monday morning comes and the expected worker is absent.

The workman who has only a day's holiday for which to plan gets into the way of pushing too much into the day; he sets out on a long excursion, spends a lot of money and returns too tired and too poor. He is apt to depend on some excitement for his pleasure, it may be the excitement of a football match or of drink, and so he does not get the recreation which enters the soul through the channels of quiet.

The clerk, on the other hand, who has a holiday of weeks, makes his plans; he arranges for a bicycle ride, for visits to friends, or even for a journey on the Continent. He has many more chances of finding means of recreation, he has time in which to discover the resources within himself, and is not so dependent on excitement. His holiday is happier for himself, and it has not disorganised his office.

It is difficult to see why the holidays of workmen should not be organised so that each man might look forward to his week or fortnight. Fashion survives so much longer than reason, or else the change would have been made long ago.

Holiday reform ranks high among necessary reforms. It must not, however, be thought that things are worse than they were or worse than they are. There is more rational holiday making, and if more people take holidays irrationally, it is a gain to many that they take holidays at all. There are also heart-raising sights, even on day-holidays, of happy family life—of children playing unconscious of time or danger; of mothers and fathers still making love in common care for their boys and girls. Holidays even now are not wholly given over to rowdiness, to nigger minstrels, to eating and drinking, or to excitement; they are often quietly and beautifully spent.

But holidays are not such as they should be, when it is considered how great is the part they have in the making of national character. They often fix on the plate of life the impressions left after long exposure to teaching. They give a bias to ambitions and settle whether a child will grow up trivial or earnest. They are the periods in which friends are made and tastes developed, their use settles whether old age will be happy or wretched. They bring out selfishness or unselfishness, and they are the tests by which neighbouring nations pass judgment.

Our holidays, considered in the light of their possibilities, must set thoughtful people mourning. There is no radical cure but that which comes through an education in the knowledge of God and of man, but the remedies I suggest would reach far. Children might be prepared for their holidays, and workmen's holidays of days might be changed for holidays of weeks. 1902.

TOWN CHILDREN IN THE COUNTRY

The Board of Education has issued a circular which enables managers and teachers in the Rural Elementary schools to take their scholars for school walks in the country, and there to teach them something of natural history, surrounded by the sights and sounds which should excite observation and awaken intellectual curiosity. But this is not all. The Department also arranged, in the Code of 1900, certain changes, in view of which it may be of some value to tell of a small experiment made the previous summer to stimulate an interest in Nature in the minds of a few of the 32,000 children who were sent by the Children's Country Holiday Fund into the country for a fortnight's holiday. The methods adopted were simple. A letter was written, printed, and sent to every London teacher whose scholars were going into the country, to many school managers, and to the clergy and others who were likely to come in contact with the children. In this letter we told our aim, asked for the aid of the teacher's sympathy, and were careful to explain that "our hope is not so much that the children should learn certain facts about Nature so that they can pass an examination, but that they should learn to observe; for we believe that in so doing

they may find pleasure and profit, and that by degrees observation will develop both reverence and care."

We also wrote a letter to be given to those children who might wish to join in the plan after hearing about it from their teachers, and to this letter we added an imaginary examination paper which served to show the kind of questions which we were planning to ask, questions which did not require study or imply knowledge, but mainly demanded observation and intelligence. But sending papers and printed letters did not exhaust our efforts to make our little plan known. Mrs. Franklin, of the "Parents' National Education Union," to whose inspiration the plan owes its birth, and two other ladies were so good as to visit certain schools, and (having secured the sympathy of the teachers) to explain to the children in simple talks some of the beauties they were to seek, or something of the pleasures such seeking would bring.

On the 27th of July some 16,000 happy children trooped into the country; two weeks afterwards another 16,000 took their places. All were back on the 26th of August, and by the 10th of September our questions were in their hands—ten easy questions for Standards III. and IV., and ten questions on the same lines but demanding closer observation for Standards V. and VI.

Children from 470 London schools were sent into the country. Fifty-two schools applied for our questions, taking 1,161 copies; but only twenty-seven schools sent in replies, as only 330 children had tried to answer in writing. But still, in-

adequate as was the response to the amount of effort which had been put forth, neither Mr. R. E. S. Hart, the Assistant-Secretary of the Children's Country Holidays Fund (who had done most of the work), nor I felt discouraged. We had made a beginning, and now that the same aim is adopted by the Government for the country children, and that greater publicity will show up the object and simplicity of the plan, it is hoped that an increasing number of children will in future begin to observe, and will find a truer joy in seeing and a wider range of subjects to see.

To the children in all the standards we gave questions about trees and flowers, asking the younger ones, "What is your favourite tree—an oak or an elm, a beech or a birch, a lime or a sycamore?" and "Say why you like best the one you choose."

To this from several children we got the stereotyped but out-of-date reply that they liked the oak best, because "the ships are made from it what defends England." The prettiest flowers a child in the third standard saw were "nosegays" and "tegtoes and garpees" in a garden; but a boy in the fourth standard had observed "Vemane, piney, purtunee, genastee, and a stursion" growing. This botanical collection was, however, improved on by a girl in the sixth standard, whose favourite flowers were "Policeman's hats" and "Break your mother's heart," two specimens which, alas! savour more of town and alley memories than country pleasures. Another child in the same standard had enjoyed "Minarets, Holy-oaks, and Chame oisters"—where, it is not said, but perhaps in Canon Lester's garden,

which was declared by a juvenile critic to be the prettiest "cottage garden" he "had ever seen."

The questions about animals excited much genuine interest, but showed that the faculty of observation had still to be cultivated. Of the children in Standards III. and IV. we asked:—

"(7) When sheep get up from lying down, do they rise with their front or their hind legs first?

"(8) Do you think that the big pigs grunt as an expression of pain, or pleasure, or both? Do the little pigs show any sign of affection to each other?

"(9) Give the names by which we call the following animals when they are babies: horse, goat, cow, fox, dog, cat, sheep, frog, rabbit, deer."

Thirty-two children out of the 127 who sent in papers were right as to the way sheep rise. Twenty only realised the difference between a pig's grunts and squeals, one girl generalising her observation in the sentence that "The grunt is the nature of the pig," and another outstepping her by the statement that "the pig grunts when he is mad." The large majority of our young nature-observers were convinced that little pigs were devoted to each other, eighteen only being doubtful on the point. But the ignorance shown of the names of the creatures was often surprising. I will give only a few instances:—

A baby horse is a ponny.
A baby fox is an ox—a thorn.
A baby deer is a reindeer—a oxen.
A baby frog is a tertpol—a fresher—a toad.
A baby sheep is a bar lamb.
A baby rabbit is a mammal.

Of the children in the fifth and sixth standards we asked :—

"(6) Did you see any rabbits? Do they run? If not, will you describe their movements? Have you ever noticed a rabbit 'wobbling its nose'? Why do you think he does it? What do rabbits drink? What animals are the enemies of rabbits?

"(7) Do sparrows and rooks walk alike? Tell me something about the movements of various birds which you have noticed. What gestures have chickens when they drink? Does any other bird drink in the same way? How many times do crows fold their wings after alighting?"

It would take too long to detail the answers so as to be fair to the writers, but the idea of the rabbit "wobbling its nose" appealed to the children, and many and various were the causes assigned for it.

"To make holes in the ground," wrote one child.

"To account for the formation of its head," was the philosophy of another.

"It does it when it does what a cow does digests it food," is a profound but an unsatisfactory explanation.

"Its washing its face" shows more credulity than observation; while another discarded reasons, and declared in a large round text-hand, regardless of grammar: "I have seen a number of rabbits wobblings *its* nose!"

Seven only answered the question rightly; but one child, although no inquiry was put concerning dogs, volunteered the information that "French puddles are kept for fancy, Irish terriers as ratters, but the boerhounds are kept for hunting the *Boers*," our sad trouble in South Africa being then on the

horizon and in the minds and mouths of many people.

Some of the people to whom I submitted our questions for helpful criticism objected to the last paragraph of this question : (9) "When did you see the moon during your holiday? Was it a new moon, a full moon, or a waning moon? What makes the moon give light?" The children, they argued, are taught this in the schools. It does not encourage observation or nature-study, and you will merely get a repetition of text-book sentences; but I felt it might help the children to connect their country pleasures with what they were taught in school, and so the six words were left in. "What makes the moon give light?"

Here are some of the replies :—

"Electricity causes the moon to shine."

"The moon revolving round the sun, which gives light by unknown planets."

"It is the darkness which shows it up."

"The moon is the shadow of the earth on the clouds."

"The eclipse of the sun."

"The clouds."

Is it possible? and this from fifth and sixth standard children!

The pity of such answers is not the ignorance but the knowledge they show. The children have in one way been taught too much; their minds have been filled with scraps, while their understandings have not been strengthened.

The last question for all standards was set to test the individual tastes of the children :—

"(10) Will you write and tell us about the thing

which you liked best during your holiday? It may be a walk, or a drive, or a sunset, or an animal, or a party, or a game, or a person. Whatever you liked very much we should like to hear about. What books have you read during your country visit?" And certainly it did not fail. Among things enjoyed most were:—

"The country boys taught me to swim."

"The head lady who was Mrs. MacRosee what paid for me at the sports."

"The drive a gentleman gave us in his carriage."

"The food I had."

"A game called 'Sisters come to Quakers meeting.'"

"A laddie where I stayed. She was a kind and gentle laddie."

"The party which Mrs. Cartwright gave us."

"Paddling at a place called flood gates."

"Watching a woman milking a cow. She held the can between her knees and pulled the milk out of the cow. I should like," adds this observer, "to be a farmer."

"I also liked the way in *witch* I was treated and also liked the respectability of Mrs. Byfield my charge," writes one young prig; but many, both boys and girls, wrote the same sentiment in simpler language—a delightful tribute to our working-class homes.

Other children, again, evidently enjoyed rare experiences. "I enjoyed most a Drive to market in a cart with four pigs in it. . . . There I saw men pulling the pigs about by their tails." Inappropriate handles, one would think. Another child showed more sympathetic feeling for the

beasts, for her greatest pleasure had been "a drive in a brake when I sat in front and was glad I was not a horse."

Two expressed real appreciation of beauty, and a perception of the spirit of the country. "The thing I liked best," wrote a fourth standard child, "was a lot of cornfields with their stalks waving in the wind;" and the other said, "We were half a mile from home it was so quiet and lonely except for the birds music, and that walk I enjoyed most."

But very few children replied as to whether they had read any books. One, however, gave a list which should awaken us all to serious thought:—

"The books I read in my two weeks," writes a boy of twelve, "was *Chips*, *Comic Cuts*, *The World's Comic*, *Funny Cuts*, *The Funny Wonder*, *Comic Home Journal*." Those of us who know the vulgarity and irreverence which make up half the fun of such serials must regret the absence of the guiding word in the choice of literature which was given to another lad, who thus had read "The Vicar of Wakefield" and "Treasure Island."

One child could not have been exactly a desirable guest, not, that is to say, if she frequently indulged in what she liked best, which was "to lay in bed and sing songs all the night!" And there is a record of a fourth standard child which on the other side is as valuable as Lord Salisbury's statement that the public-house had no attractions and no temptations for children under sixteen, for she has written that "what I liked best all the time was that I met a brewer"—a kind man seemingly, who gave her a ride.

But if I tell more of this sort of answers I shall

give a wrong impression of the value of the work done by the children, or convey an untrue idea of the success of the plan. On the whole the papers were encouraging. They were exceedingly varied—some deserving the adjective "excellent," some unquestionably bad, their value depending on the trouble taken by the teachers, on the interest shown by the school managers, to some extent on the locality and on the care of the ladies who by the organisation of the Country Holidays Fund overlook the children during their visits in the villagers' cottages, acting as outside hostesses. It is always difficult to generalise with accuracy, but almost without exception more originality was shown among children in the younger standards and from Voluntary schools. In the upper standards and from the Board Schools there was less variety, the replies being more stereotyped, the children from the same school often bearing the impress of the training received rather than the development of their own individuality in tastes and interests.

Of the drawings asked from children of Standards V. and VI. several were admirable, giving evidence of both delicate discernment and certainty of stroke. But when animals were attempted they showed more likeness to the cheap toys "made in Germany," which are the heritage of the poor, than to the creatures of freer movements on the common or in the farmyard. Some six or eight of the collections of grasses were good, evincing care and choice; but others again merely exhibited the desire to get a lot, quite regardless of their varieties or their interest. One child had observed closely and described graphically the flower of the lime;

another likened the birch-tree to a "graceful lady"; two distinguished between the way white, red, and black currants grew on their respective stems. Several children wrote comprehensive lists of the flowers which flourished in cornfields; and five had noticed how out of wheat, barley, and rye, the latter grew the tallest, for "good rye grows high." A boy from a very poor neighbourhood in East London wrote a really telling description of a team of horses reaping, and many a little one expressed its pleasure or interest in childlike but fitting language. Some ten or twelve described carefully watched sunsets in quaint words and with poetical feeling. Fifteen children had noticed how many times a crow folded its wings after alighting on the ground; and a considerable number (especially boys) had watched intelligently the walks and other movements of various birds, and could accurately report on the gestures of chickens when drinking. One child wrote an excellent original story about a grateful cat, and several others offered shreds of narratives which give promise in future of a more intelligent consideration of the habits and ways of the creatures.

When the papers were all in, they were adjudged and marked—150 was the maximum number of marks. One child in Standard VII. got 114 and another 107. Ten children obtained over 75, and one hundred over 50. We then assembled all three hundred and thirty together at Toynbee Hall to a monster tea-party. The thirty prize-winners received books about nature and framed pictures of flowers. To each of the hundred whose achievements allowed them to be marked at 50 was given a hyacinth bulb

in a glass, and to each of the two hundred who had tried but not succeeded was presented a consolation gift of an illustrated magazine. Thus all were gladdened, and the experiment was concluded amid smiles.

The result is, I believe, such as to encourage its extension for town children when they are in the country, and on the same lines as are suggested for rural children in the circular of the Board of Education already referred to, which says :—

"One of the main objects of the teacher should be to develop in every boy and girl that habit of inquiry and research so natural to children; they should be encouraged to ask their own questions about the simple phenomena of Nature which they see around them, and themselves to search for flowers, plants, insects, and other objects to illustrate the lessons which they have learnt with their teacher.

"The teacher should as occasion offers take the children out of doors for school walks at the various seasons of the year, and give simple lessons on the spot about animals in the fields and farmyards, about ploughing and sowing, about fruit trees and forest trees, about birds, insects and flowers, and other objects of interest. The lessons thus learnt out of doors can be afterwards carried forward in the schoolroom by Reading, Composition, Pictures, and Drawing.

"In this way, and in various other ways that teachers will discover for themselves, children who are brought up in village schools will learn to understand what they see about them, and to take an intelligent interest in the various processes of

Nature. This sort of teaching will, it is hoped, directly tend to foster in the children a genuine love for the country and for country pursuits."

It is not only to provide the child with greater pleasure in the country and its life that the Board of Education have adopted this plan, for the circular goes on to say that "it is confidently expected that the child's intelligence will be so quickened by the kind of training that is here suggested that he will be able to master, with far greater ease than before, the ordinary subjects of the school curriculum."

Neither is the ultimate utilitarian view left out of sight, for "the Board consider it highly desirable that the natural activities of children should be turned to useful account—that their eyes, for example, should be trained to recognise plants and insects that are useful or injurious (as the case may be) to the agriculturist, that their hands should be trained to some of the practical dexterities of rural life and not merely to the use of pen and pencil, and that they should be taught, when circumstances permit, how to handle the simpler tools that are used in the garden or on the farm, before their school life is over."

It is such teaching, if intelligently given, that will do much to solve the problem of the dearth of agricultural labour, and be an influence in stopping the inrush of the rural population to towns.

But my subject is the joy of town children when on their country holidays, and it is good to know that the habit of taking country holidays—real holidays and not day treats—is greatly increasing. Thousands of children are sent by Holidays Committees from all the great cities to stay for a

fortnight or three weeks with cottage hosts. More go by their own arrangements, often to the same persons whose friendship they had made in previous visits.

It is not enough, however, to provide change: the power to use change must at the same time be educated. Children need to be taught to enjoy as much as they need to be taught to work. Critics who complain of our plan, and say when they themselves take holiday they "do nothing," forget with what an equipment they start—how much their eyes see and their ears hear when they are doing their "nothing!"

The children of the poor, familiar only with the sights and sounds of the streets, and with the home talk about the cares of daily life, trained in school on paying subjects, find "doing nothing" very tiring, and mischief often follows weariness. They cannot with advantage lie under a hedge and dream; they are unacquainted with country games or the knowledge which provides recreation. If, however, teachers, managers, and country ladies will take trouble to interest the children in what may be seen in a country lane, or to follow the fortunes of the inhabitants of a pear-tree, or to admire the beauty of the sky, or to observe the habits of a creature without commercial value, the children would not only have more lively minds, but they would more really enjoy themselves and their holidays.

Nature is the kind teacher of children, the teacher most likely to draw out from them their undiscovered powers, to stimulate their fancy and satisfy their restless longings. But Nature must be intro-

duced by those who already are her friends and who can exhibit her cunning beauty to the unobservant.

The experiment in which I have had the pleasure of taking part has shown in a small and imperfect way how such an introduction can be effected, and how the suggestion that there is joy in looking can be applied.

1900.

TOWN CHILDREN AND COUNTRY INTERESTS

It is in the hope of interesting those ladies who give time and strength to the welfare of the many children who spend happy fortnights in the country that I am asked to write a short account of a plan that some of us have been trying to work for the last few years.

I need not trouble you with methods of organisation; enough to say that any child sent out by the Children's Country Holidays Fund, who likes, can take the questions we ask, and try and answer them, or send us pressed flowers and grasses. The best get prizes, and all receive a consolation gift. About a thousand children have already enjoyed our plan.

Our object is to teach them to observe and enjoy Nature, and in a letter which is yearly sent to ask the teachers' aid we explain that:—

"We are wishful that the children who go into the country for their fortnight's holiday should learn to observe and care for the sights and sounds of Nature. Too often they carry town interests, town games, and town thoughts with them, and thereby lose much of the good which would perhaps come to them could they be interested and watch the birds and flowers, the sky and animals."

Every year the questions are a little different, but they are all very easy, and are such that each child is able to answer if it looks enough. They are written also in the hope of directing the child's attention to commonplace things, and encouraging it to ask questions of its cottage friends. I add a few examples of questions already set :—

> What flowers grow in a cornfield? Which grew the tallest this year, wheat, barley, or rye?
>
> What were the hedges made of in the part of the country where you took your holiday? Were there many hips and haws and red berries in the hedgerows and trees when you were in the country? Of what flowers are these the fruits? Did you hear what was their use when the snow is on the ground?
>
> How often are the cows milked? once a day or twice a day? Can you describe how they milk the cows? Do you know what is meant by chewing the cud? When chewing the cud, does the cow seem contented and happy.

And then, in order to get at what the children really individually enjoy, we asked :—

> What did you enjoy most during your holiday? Did you read any new books? or learn a new game, or find out how to dig, or reap, or bud roses, or sow seeds, or climb trees, or to swim? Describe whatever gave you pleasure.

The reply shows how pathetic are the simple pleasures: "To see the ducks swim"; "to pick a flower to send to mother"; "to sit on the hay-stacks and sing"; "to watch the rabbits fristle (!) in the sun"; and sad often are the amusements

most enjoyed: "Chasing rabbits"; "making ponies roll"; killing rabbits," are among the regrettable pursuits. Listening to "nigger songs" show the vacant minds of some of the children; though the oft-repeated reply, "The lady I stayed with," shows the kindness which is ever ready to well up in the hearts of the cottage hostesses.

Some of the replies are very—though unintentionally—comic; to some young non-observant observers the hedges were a source of difficulty. "The hedges, as far as I was concerned, was made up of stinging nettles," writes one egoist; another asserted that "The hedges in the part of the country where I was, was made up of trees, bushes, and sweethearts."

The question about the habits of the cow drew forth many replies: "When she is chewing the cud she lies on her side and looks very miserable"! "The cow seems happy and contentive when *he* is chewing the cud"; while a fifth standard child went one further and found "The cow, when chewing the cud, just like a boy when chewing a caramel." One described the process: "After they have taken enough into their stomachs they lay down and bring it all up, and chew it over again, and then it goes in the real stomach, *never to come up again*"! There is a delightful tone of certainty about that reply, only equalled by the child whose sympathy led it to affirm that "Cows make an indigesting noise."

We asked this question:—

> Can you draw a goose? What are the differences in appearance between a goose and a duck?

and got these amongst other replies:—

"The goose is a father bird and the duck a mother bird"; "the goose makes a cack-cack noise"; "the peak of a duck is not so long as a goose's peak"; while one young naturalist affirmed: "If you were to let ducks grow they would grow to a goose"; surely a most confusing farmyard law. Another had observed that "The goose warbles, but the pig walketh"; another, more precise, says "The goose has a nob on its beak."

We wished to direct the attention of the children to frogs and toads, because they are the creatures which children consider least, and harm most recklessly, so we asked:—

> How do you know a toad from a frog? Do they move differently? Did you ever hear of anybody who made a pet of a toad?

Here are some of the replies: "A toad is a very small frog"; "a toad is grey and can whistle, a frog is brown and cannot whistle." We can thus understand the scorn of boys for frogs. Another had much more inaccurate learning, and wrote: "The frog is an amphibious reptile, and a toad is a bacteractian reptile"; a confused statement which is hardly cleared by the addition of "that is he and she." Another thought that "the toad is a male and the frog a female"; and the idea that toads could be made pets of—which was put in to suggest that another use than hunting them was possible—was replied to by one child as follows: "Ladies are frightened of toads and gentlemen have not the time, so they are not made pets of."

I wish to keep this paper short, but I must quote you this charming reply of a girl about the swallow:

"The swallow builds its nest under the eaves of a house. I watched a swallow building the nest. She would fly and get some mud and stick it to the side of the house. She began by forming a cup of mud, then some hay and feathers were brought. This she did until the nest was complete." Is not this pretty?

In reply to the following question—

> What time did the sun set during your holiday? Tell me some of the colours in the sky during the most beautiful sunset that you saw? Did you notice anything about the shadows of the trees?

a child wrote:—

"One day the sunset would seem as if there was a great fire in heaven, and another day all would be blue with lights dotted over it. One evening it was red with golden stripes, and there was a little black cloud in the shape of a castle." To teach a London child to look up and to watch and to love the sunset marvels is no slight good. Another child seemed to have got a glimpse of the joy of quietude, for she writes: "What gave me most pleasure was when I was lost. As I walked along the lane alone the sights were very beautiful."

Many other replies were received, some showing amazing ignorance, some real care for Nature, others evincing observation, or abundant joy, or capacity for feeling the fraternity of the animal world; and all showing awakening interest.

Why do I write all this? for we do not need money. Some of us who believe that Dame Nature is the best of teachers find the small sums that are necessary for the prizes; and Toynbee Hall is

yearly the kind host of the prize-winners. It is not your money, but your interest and your help when you are in the country that is badly needed.

Wherever you go in the country, from July 27th until August 26th, you will find some town children; for all the great provincial towns have taken up the plan of sending their poor children into the country for a week or a fortnight in the summer. *Will you see them?* Not in great batches, but in threes and fours; not for a few patronising minutes, but for two or three hours, and interest them in the country sights and sounds. Will you take them for walks, or invite them to your home? Will you teach them wholesome games?

There is no occasion to invite many or to make elaborate preparations. Let three or four come from four to six and share the "lydy's polite tea"; or from three to five, when you can send them back to the cottager's more substantial meal. The talk need not be of microscopic details, but, recognising that you have touched the bottom of botanical ignorance when you have a London child before you, the simplest facts of Nature can be shown and explained, and the tone of admiration set.

"'Tis all rot, and I don't care!" was the verdict I got from a boy of nine when I tried to awaken his admiration for a flower. "Oh, ain't it beautiful!" and he mimicked my voice. So I tried him with a few facts about the creatures, and, later on, with a little elementary news on how the rivers helped to form the country, and found below his ill manners he had a mind which he really enjoyed using.

Those ladies to whom the strength may not be given to play or to go walking with the children,

may find other ways of helping them to fill their holidays profitably. The girls can be shown how to knit, to crochet, or to tat. To dress a doll creates great interest, and generosity can be encouraged if the doll is voted to be given to some weakling among the guests, not among its dressers.

Pictures can be stuck in scrap-books, and their pages decorated with pressed leaves or dried grasses chosen and gathered for the purpose. Some children can be inspired to draw, and they especially enjoy memory drawing, for it makes so much fun.

"Now go and watch the pigs," the geese, the ducks, the donkeys, the cows, the horses, the sheep, whatever creature is available for the children to study away from the street and apart from smells, and "then come back and we will each draw him," one can say to a little group—care being taken to mention only one of the creatures for one afternoon —and away they will troop, returning so hot, noisy, and eager. A small bundle of half-sheets of note-paper, some pencils, and perhaps a properly-drawn illustration of the creature selected (to be shown later when the efforts have been made) will produce shrieks of happy laughter and, by developing observation, a frequent source of pleasure in sub-sequent walks. The same plan can be adopted with trees, flowers, leaves, ships, and clouds, varied perhaps by the proposal that each child should imitate the animal's sounds or show how he moves. They laugh until you almost wish to cry at their untainted joy in their efforts to show you how the sparrow hops or the wagtail runs. Their rendering of the creatures' sounds often shows considerable musical and imitative capacity—the coo, coo-oow,

coo-oor of the wood-pigeon and the hisses of the goose being special favourites.

Some children delight to try and work the puzzles which are now offered in most children's serials. "Can you write a little story without any *e*'s?" a little group were asked. "Oh! yes. You mean about no boys, only girls," was the reply, but the interest grew when the children learnt that the story was to be told only in words without the letter *e* in them, and credible the result.

It is also helpful to start simple collections—pebbles or shells of a particular colour or shape (if the sea shore is near by), white heather, four-leaved clover, pink vetch, flowering nettles, purple woodbine, or the greatest number of yellow flowers, or varied grasses, or the different leaves off the hedges of a specified lane. If the lady will see the children, say eight or ten of them, after midday dinner, and send them off on the search, receiving them again some three hours afterwards, showing discriminating pleasure at their varied successes (children so genuinely despise universal approval), and awarding, say, sweeties, a cake, or a garden flower to the most effortful maiden, it will mean not only a mischief-free afternoon, but great pleasure of a mind-enriching sort.

Nothing has been said about holiday reading, and perhaps no words are necessary; but it may be as well to suggest that the books with which every lady in touch with children supplies herself for lending purposes, should be more or less about the country, its sights and sounds, its creatures and birds; and for those children who do not take to natural history, the books offered should, during

these fortnights, have their scenes laid in the country, which to a town-bred child needs the explanation which a tale often gives. Children also delight in learning poetry, and some of them understand reading it. Tennyson as a penny poet read in a lane is an experiment worth trying. If one lends the poetry book and invites the child to learn the piece she likes best, one is often startled at the insight the choice shows into some of life's problems or its poetic solutions—or is it the rhyme only?

There are few things so pathetic as the pleasure-memories of the poor. "Don't you remember," they say, and then recount with all the gusto of an oft-recalled memory some small incident or kindly joke, many years old, planted deep because it took place on one of the rare workless days which were turned into "holy-days" by the gift of some one's time and sympathy. And as it is the same with the children, it becomes almost a sacred duty to fill their country fortnights with thoughts, ideals, new games, play handicrafts, and home occupations, which may not only make gladder the fortnight in the country, but help to enlarge their store-rooms of good memories and keep the children more out of the streets when again amid the four million town livers.

I fear to weary my readers by suggesting more of the many ways of filling the children's time when in the country with fertilising occupations, and each child-lover will find out the best methods for herself. The only principles to bear in mind are (1) To consider each child's individuality; (2) To show things so as to awaken the child's

own powers of observation; and (3) To teach facts in a way that stimulates the desire to learn more. To give the self-content of a little knowledge is to harm a young soul by hindering its growth.

If you will thus guide a few children you cannot tell the difference it will make to their often empty lives or shallow minds. You, whose lives are over-crammed with interest, cannot realise the thought-barrenness of an alley-bred child. It is life—daily life—in the neighbourhood of the poor which alone brings these facts home to one in all their intensity; and it is my twenty-eight years of life in Whitechapel which is now giving me the privilege of asking your help to sow seeds of admiration and reverence in town children's minds. To teach them to seek and to care for the beautiful, and to be controlled enough to hear the wind and to feel the earth quake, and to see the fire which often precedes the "still small voice" of the Almighty, is to give an undying power.

"The lydy showed us how the tree went round," one sharp-featured, shrill-voiced child told me. My imagination flew to a revolving tree which had hitherto been an unknown botanical marvel to me; but what she meant was that the "lydy" had shown her how the seed become root, and trunk, and leaf, and flower, and pod, and then seed again —a revolving view that never palled. That lady had given an idea. What higher gift can any one human being give another? Will you then give *time* to give ideas; in town to visit schools; in the country as walkers, talkers, hostesses? You need not be a great botanist or naturalist; anyhow, if you know much or little, your talk to the children will be of

nobler things than the last tragedy in Dorset Street or the neighbour's sins; and the sympathetic attitude towards creatures, and the non-destructive tone of thought about growing things (which is part of the furniture of every cultivated and refined mind) will be news to many of these court and back-street children, and will help them to enjoy their holidays and to find something more in them even than enjoyment. Many who read this will have given money, time, and thought to bring the children into the country. This is good—but

> "The gift without the giver is bare,
> They doubly give who also share."

1901.

PART V

HOUSING

THE GARDEN SUBURB AT HAMPSTEAD

Every year London grows, stretching out into the country long and generally unlovely arms. The classes are divided in the suburbs as definitely as in the towns. Every one is familiar with the localities monopolised by the rich, with their beautiful homes, surrounded by their beautiful gardens; and most people have seen the suburbs inhabited by the lower middle class, with their small villas side by side, their few yards of garden carefully cherished, the monotony of mediocrity unbroken by fine public buildings or large open spaces.

Less familiar are the districts occupied by the industrial classes, with the rows and rows of small houses, every one alike, with limited backyards, each only divided from the other by a wall. No gardens, no trees, no open spaces, no public buildings, no children's playgrounds, no spacious thoroughfares, no broad, shady roads, the whole stamped by the landlord's greed, the builder's competition, and the people's helplessness. A combination which has produced miles of "mean streets," wherein are reared generations of children robbed of their birthright of joyful communion with Nature.

Is this state of things a necessity of our civilisation? As our towns yearly grow in population and show a continuous tendency to spread out, can we hope for nothing more than a repetition of those dreary roads full of trivial villas, those ranks of closely-built gardenless boxes? Must we be content, now that education is bringing all sorts of people nearer together in sympathy, to have classes topographically divided by an arbitrary division depending upon their rent-paying powers? Is it a natural sequence that hundreds of people with multiform possibilities and varied tastes should be obliged to live in houses exactly alike, so close that there is not room to develop their tastes, or opportunity of turning buried potentialities into facts?

No one can think that the seclusion of the poor in less desirable districts and the monopoly by the rich of the more favoured portions of London's environment is righteous, and the *raison d'être* of this short paper is to tell of an opportunity of laying out a suburb on different lines.

The Eton College Trustees own 240 acres of land lying to the north-west of and adjoining Hampstead Heath. The option to purchase these acres they have given to a body of persons henceforth to be known as "The Garden Suburb Trust," who have joined together in the hope of establishing a suburb where the aim will be to house people of many different incomes, and which will be free, it is hoped, from the evils of monotony and inertia which invariably exist where one class only congregate.

The members of the Garden Suburb Trust are Earl Grey (who had, however, to sever his connection on leaving England to become Governor-

General of Canada), the Earl of Crewe, the Bishop of London, Sir John Gorst, Sir Robert Hunter, Mr. Herbert Marnham, Mr. Walter Hazell, and the writer.

The land offered is undulating, rising from 170 to 360 feet above the sea-level; the soil is suitable both for building and gardening, and water and gas are ready to be supplied respectively by the New River and the Gas Light and Coke Companies. Recently 80 acres of open space have been purchased by the joint action of private generosity and the municipal authorities, and this tongue of common land thrusts itself through the area included in the 240 acres, thus giving to the Garden Suburb Trust the monopoly of the advantage which frontage on to this new and beautiful space confers.

Under strict building covenants some of the most attractive portions of this land, many of which have extensive prospects and some of great beauty, will be leased (not sold) to the rich in 1, 2, 3 acre plots, and as land on the other side of the Heath, facing north and much further from the railway, has been recently sold for £5,000 an acre, it is hoped that these specially favoured positions will produce a large ground rent. Beyond it is proposed that smaller plots should be set apart for people of humbler means, whose gardens must be less extensive, whose houses less ambitious, but to whom opportunities will be given of building their own homes to meet their own needs—always providing that the fundamental principle is complied with, that the part should not spoil the whole, nor that individual rights be assumed to carry the power of working communal or individual wrongs.

It not being the object nor the intention of the

Garden Suburb Trust to make money, every acre which fetches a large price will release, as it were, other acres to be devoted to the erection of cottages for the industrial classes.

Experience has taught that if cottages are each to have a garden large enough to be productive as well as pleasurable (say the tenth of an acre) the land must not cost more than £150 an acre. The ground for roads must be deducted, and the cost of their making must be proportionately added to the various classes of properties; and when that is calculated, the acreage that can be reckoned at £150 an acre will be devoted to cottage dwellings for the industrial classes. How many acres that will be it is impossible to tell, but it is believed that the specially attractive portions will fetch such large sums that at least a third of the whole will be available for the houses for the industrial classes, and from these gardened cottages deeper things than flowers and fruit will grow. Arthur Young is said to have spoken of the "Magic of property which turns sand into gold," further explaining the phrase by saying, "put a man into precarious possession and he will turn a garden into a desert, but put him into a state where he can securely anticipate the fruits of his labour, and he will turn a desert into a garden." That this is still true we have the testimony of Mr. Cadbury, who reports that his Bournville tenants, each with a garden just under an eighth of an acre in extent, have made an average profit of 1s. 11½d. a week, a material reduction of house rents varying from 5s. 6d. to 8s. 6d. a week. Of the ethical value of working in the gardens Mr. Cadbury writes: "The

benefit, physically, morally, and even spiritually is so great that it would have been worth while cultivating the gardens even if there had been no profit from the labour expended. I would also point out that the adoption of garden cities would materially increase the food supply of the country, as one acre of garden ground produces as much food as thirteen acres of pasture land."

But in order to realise the need of some such plan as is in the minds of the members of the Garden Suburb Trust, my readers must be told or reminded of some grievous facts.

The census showed that over 3,000,000 people were living in over-crowded conditions in England and Wales, the standard for "over-crowding" being that of the Registrar-General of more than two persons in one room. In London some 800,000 people exist under the same conditions and over "330,000 have to live, eat, sleep, be ill and die—yes, and be born—in one room." The death-rate consequent on these conditions is very high. Dr. Newman, the Medical Officer of Health for Finsbury, shows in his interesting report that the death-rate per 1,000 in one-room tenements is 38·9, in two-room tenements is 22·6, in three-room tenements 11·7, and only 5·6 in tenements of four rooms and upwards.

For all London the death-rate is 15·7, in Finsbury 19·6, in Hornsey 7·9. Bethnal Green has 365 people living on the acre, and its death-rate is 18·2. But, as Mrs. Edwin Gray points out in an admirable paper, "the death-rate is not the only result of over-crowding in the houses, and on the acre, it is but the sign of a gigantic evil. Where the death-rate

is high, there we find a lowered vitality, a large amount of sickness, and a general disinclination to work; there we see the jaded, spiritless man and woman," whose only pleasures often become those of alcohol and gambling, supplying the excitement and interest which the natural pleasures of family life, household welfare and spade labour with its results, still provide, if circumstances can be so arranged as to permit of them.

Many reasons have been alleged for the increased number of lunatics which the State has to support in its monster asylums; but the facts brought out by our old friend, Mr. Will Crooks, M.P., show that bad housing has a potent influence on it. The increase for all London was 1·9 per cent., the increase for over-crowded districts was 10·1 per cent., while Mr. George Haw is responsible for the statement that in six large towns over 20,000 unnecessary deaths annually occur owing to overcrowded dwellings and insanitary conditions.

Many people think that the remedy of the housing problem is only to be found in the assumption of the responsibility by the State, as has been done in Germany. Part III. of the Housing Act of 1890 gives power to English local authorities to buy land outside their town boundaries for the purpose of "increasing the number of workmen's dwellings," and already it has been used by about 40 municipalities. However excellent in intention, it has in practice the great disadvantage of limiting a neighbourhood entirely to persons of one social class. The new estate of 225 acres at Tottenham, purchased by the London County Council at £400 an acre, is planned to house 42,500 persons in 5,779

cottages, at a cost of £1,530,000; the houses, besides about 250 shops, differing only so far as they contain two or three bedrooms. At Latchmere, where the Battersea Borough Council is carrying out a building scheme, similar residences will be provided at the cost of £105,000, but there again all the tenants will be of the same social position. That this separation of different classes into different districts results in social and economic disadvantages is shown by the example of a London suburb where, with a population of 63,000, there are only 123 houses with a rental that exceeds £50 a year. In this suburb the rates are the highest in England, 11s. 3d. in the £, with an education rate of 2s. 10d., a contrast to its neighbour, a middle-class district, where the school-rate is 8d. The English system of government is based on the belief that there is in every district a leisured and cultivated class able to give time and thought to municipal and other public duties, and when such a class is absent the whole suffers both financially and ethically. Toynbee Hall is but an artificial protest against the massing in one locality of the poor, whose engrossment in daily labour often makes them both deaf to higher calls and dumb as to their own deepest needs.

When the poorer people are crowded together in the mean, gardenless streets, the neighbourhood becomes less desirable for those who, being blessed with more of this world's goods, or who, having reached the "afternoon of life," wish to live with more repose, surrounded by the varied but indefinite influences known as amenities. Those, therefore, who are able to choose, seek other

neighbourhoods, and thus the poorer localities are deprived of the contagion of refinement which contact brings, and the richer people lose the inspiration which knowledge of strenuous lives and patient endurance ever provokes. Society is impoverished by class divisions, and each class loses more than it realises.

If our Garden Suburb Scheme ever gets beyond a hope, the classes will not be estranged, and the estate will have the great advantage of being planned, not in piecemeal as plots are taken by different builders, but as a whole. It shows the far-seeing wisdom of Mr. Andrew Carnegie that in his gift to his native town in Scotland, he gives not only the beautiful park and glen of Pittencrieff, but an annual income of £25,000. Thus the trustees will be enabled to improve and develop each part of the town in relation to the other parts, so as to " bring into the toiling masses of Dunfermline more of sweetness and light ; to give to them (especially the young) some charm, some happiness, some elevating conditions of life which residence elsewhere would have denied," a beautiful ideal not, I fear, to be achieved in any neighbourhood if relegated to dwellings of one sort only, or left to the mercy of an owner of this plot or that site, on which hideous buildings can be erected, distorting the prospect, or blotting out the view.

In the Garden Suburb Estate it will be an essential condition of building that the dwellings of all classes be made attractive with their own distinctive attractions, as are the cottage and the manor house of the English village; the larger gardens of the rich helping to keep the air pure,

and the sky view more liberal; the cottage gardens adding that cosy, generous element which ever follows the spade when affectionately and cunningly wielded as a man's recreation. The houses will not be put in uniform lines, nor in close relationship, built regardless of each other, or without consideration for picturesque appearance. Each one will be surrounded with its own garden, and every road will be planted with trees, and be not less than forty feet wide. Great care will be taken that houses shall not spoil each other's outlook, and that the noise of children shall be locally limited, while the avoidance of uniformity or of an institutional aspect will be obtained by the variety of the dwellings provided.

A Community, however, consists not only of houses. For its higher life it will need houses of prayer, a library, schools, a lecture hall and club houses. For its physical well-being our community will need shops, baths and wash-houses, bakehouses, refreshment rooms and arbours, co-operative stores and agencies for the purpose of fostering interest in gardens and allotments, and the lending of tools which are beyond the means to purchase and unnecessary for every one individually to possess. Among the advantages of a community are the joint conveniences which proximity permits, and which enable economy to be practised without undue effort.

It will need also playgrounds for the smaller children and resting-places for the aged who could not walk so far as from the end of the estate to the Heath. There will be cottages with individual gardens, and cottages grouped round a quadrangle

or common sward, used perhaps, as a tennis-court for teachers before the twopenny tube carries them to their work in London's centre, and later for their young guests whose joy will be to "visit teacher" on Saturday afternoons and summer evenings. There will be the semi-detached two-storied houses, on the ground floor of which will dwell the family, with the man at its head who is ready and capable of working neatly and productively his tenth of an acre, and on the first floor the poor lady or working woman who takes no less a delight in flowers and grass plots because she cannot dig, and whose refining influence will help the children, while their mother will be glad to earn something by doing her domestic work.

There will be associated residences for young men whose common garden and creeper-draped balconies will doubtless be a common joy. There will be, I hope, the convalescent home, the co-operative rest-house, the training school and the working lads' hostel—for a community should bear the needy and the handicapped in daily mind. There will be the deep-porched and broad-balconied tenements for the old, the single and the weakly, whose capacities and infirmities, while hindering action, do not hinder suffering from noise, crowd and dirt, nor the power to enjoy the kinder environment befitting their later days.

There will be—but why go on? one may perhaps have to live in Whitechapel for thirty-two years to picture in all its detail what a Garden Suburb which will include the industrial classes might mean—will mean, if the Trust can carry the scheme through, with its foundation thought that

the good and the gain be shared by all classes of society, living within one another's knowledge, under the same local government, and in common enjoyment of common open space, obtained largely by common contributions.

"And how is the money to be raised?" my business friends will ask—and to that question I cannot yet reply. The money will not be charity money (though some may be needed later for the public buildings); the money will be invested money, and it will be safe, for land beginning at under five miles, and ending at six miles from Charing Cross, and brought into a "twopenny tube" touch with all parts of London by the Electric Railway, cannot be a bad security—and in the hands of the speculative builder would yield a large profit on the price that is being asked for it. But his standard of success is not our standard of success, though we are at one in the determination that the experiment, if begun, shall pay.

The intention of the Garden Suburb Trust is to issue at once a statement setting forth their plans. "If the response of the public is sympathetic and if adequate capital is offered, it will then be their pleasure to forward, on usual business lines, the formation of a Company which, while limiting the interest on capital to 5 per cent., will proceed to develop the estate on the conditions and principles which are here laid down, devoting all subsequent profits to the improvement of the Estate or to the encouragement of similar enterprises."

If the public are indifferent the Trust will recognise their failure, and reluctantly refuse the option offered in so public-spirited a manner by the Eton

College Trustees, and bear in sadness to see the beautiful and historic view injured by rows of small houses and miles of mean streets; for it is they which pay best, and the Eton College Vendors are also the Eton College Trustees. But, to quote a surveyor's report: "The additional interest and beauty which can be imparted to this suburb will prove to be its greatest commercial asset; it is this which will give to the Estate its unique character, and enable it to attract the best class of tenant from all classes of society. We feel sure that reasonable expenditure to secure this character will be found to produce a very handsome return."

The Trust itself aims at receiving nothing, but by its work and thought to show what can be done to form a suburb which shall alike be good for those who see and who dwell therein. 1905.

The interest shown in the proposal to create a garden suburb was so great that a company was formed in March, 1906, *of which the Right Hon. Alfred Lyttelton, K.C., M.P., became the President.*

The development of the scheme may best be understood by an extract from one of his speeches:—

"The growth of our great cities present the most formidable and the most pressing problem to all those who wish for the welfare of our race. It is to this problem that this Company has addressed itself, and I think we are able to put through the plans we have in view. All of us who have any share in it may feel that they have done something, however small, to the mitigation of those ills which these congested cities offer.

"We wish, in the first place, to have pretty and wholesome dwellings with gardens and open spaces at hand where working men and clerks may live who are engaged in London, and whither they may go for a fare of 2d. from any quarter of the Metropolis.

"We wish, in the next place, to have an orderly and well-designed plan of the Estate, so that each house may be placed with a regard to every other house. The views that are so beautiful in Hampstead being made accessible to all, everybody having some share in them, and the plan laid out from the beginning, and broadly adhered to throughout the whole development of the Estate, so that there may not exist, as we too often see, houses laid out at haphazard, views blocked, and open spaces not accessible, to some portion of the little community.

"Our design is to make a community, as is natural and right, of all classes, and to endeavour to obtain that understanding one with another, that feeling of comradeship, and that sense of the traditions which a community as this, started in this way, and with this spirit, engender.

"We wish to make the life of the Hampstead Suburb a life in which men shall have understanding of each other, in which the poor shall teach the rich, and in which the rich shall, let us hope, in some ways teach the poor, and minister to them. And then there is a fourth design, very dear to some of us, I think—and I think I may mention Mrs. Barnett and Sir Robert Hunter in this connexion particularly, as they have done so much for it in the past—to preserve the natural beauties of this district, and in so doing (we must not

divorce ourselves from commerce) we hope to make the property attractive, indeed, uniquely attractive, to those who seek residence thereon.

"The prospectus of the Company was issued on March 9, 1906. It applied for 50,000 shares and £80,000 in debentures, and although we have never had recourse to advertising the prospectus at all, the result of that application which was sent round was for the shares £34,280, and for the debentures £57,683, which gives us a total, up to the present time (July 17, 1906), of no less than £91,963.

"The response to this application has enabled us to take up the option of purchase of the Estate from Eton College, and we have pushed forward the Bill in Parliament, which will give the Company a position of some freedom with regard to roads, and will enable it to give better effect to its views relating to the provision of gardens and open spaces. The Bill also empowers the Company to pay dividends out of capital to a limited extent, and under it the restriction on building, namely, that not more than eight houses to the acre on the average throughout the Estate shall be built, is made binding on the Company.

"I should like publicly to acknowledge the good feeling and co-operation which we have received at the hands of the Hendon local authority. Had they not welcomed us so courteously and so generously, we might have been put to very great expense, and we hope most cordially that the co-operation and good feeling we have received at the outset may be continued, to our mutual benefit.

"The plan which was sent out with the pro-

spectus (of course, only a sketch plan) has now to be carefully and minutely gone through and perfected, showing the levels, the gradients, the position of the sewers, of the roads, and the exact positions where the houses will be placed in the ultimate development of the Estate. For this purpose we have had, and are having, the great advantage of the assistance of Mr. Raymond Unwin, whose name is well known in other enterprises of a kindred character, and with him is associated Mr. Edward Lutyens, the distinguished architect who has been so kind as to give us his assistance in council and conference with Mr. Unwin."

After referring in some detail to the applications for land which have already been received, Mr. Lyttelton concluded :—

"Though I never like to be too sanguine, I think the applications are only a sample of those we may have, and that I am justified in regarding the prospects as sound, and in congratulating those concerned in the enterprise, in the hopeful character of a scheme which, if it fulfils its ideal, will mark a real step in progress."

Since those words were spoken, in July, 1906, the affairs of the Company have progressed satisfactorily. Applications for land, shares, and debenture stock have come in with gratifying persistency. Steady advance has been made in the details as well as on the general lines of the plan, and although the legal formalities have taken much longer time than had been anticipated, that is owing to the fact that the Eton College trustees found it necessary to conclude the sale of the eighty

acres allocated for open space, and which will be in the custody of the London County Council before the arrangements with the Garden Suburb Company could be completed.

However, during the period of pause the directors have got everything in readiness to begin operations, so that before many weeks are over the long-cherished ideal will be made manifest in part, though not in whole. I say "long cherished," for to some of us a building estate laid out as a whole, a place where all classes can be united by common interest in the gardens held and cultivated by each and all: a township in which rich and poor will have equal enjoyment of God's gifts of natural beauty, has been a dream wakingly dreamed for many years; but from the inception of this particular scheme it is not long, as time has to be counted in undertakings of this magnitude. It was only in 1904 that the Garden Suburb Committee was initiated (under the presidency of first Lord Grey, and then, when he went to Canada, of Lord Crewe), to hold the option from the Eton College trustees until such time as they could learn if the public cared enough for the ideal to aid in its realisation. It was in 1905 only that I wrote the article in the *Contemporary Review* which resulted in such abundant response. It was on May 3, 1907, the first road was begun; since then houses have rapidly sprung up. "Houses" I have written: "homes," I hope; each with a garden to be a joy ground for the old, the strong, and the young together.

And now in the spring of 1908 we have nearly three miles made, and though no one would choose them as a favourite drive for a new carriage or a

stumbling horse, yet they are quite passable, and I have already been driven in a taximeter the whole length of the principal roads, as well as up one or two of the subsidiary ones; but it is only fair to say, in case our contractor should be looked on with covetous eyes, that we have saved the surface of the roads by sleeper tracks, which have also made the winter's work easier for many a patient beast with loaded cart.

Along these roads have sprung up many houses; a charming group designed by Messrs. Unwin and Parker, and built by the Co-partnership "Hampstead Tenants," stand at that entrance of the Estate which leads off from the Finchley Road; already over forty are occupied, sixty-two are in process of erection, and another hundred are arranged for. Opposite the first group, and to be seen from those of the avenues leading down to it, lie 4½ acres of open space, at present a quagmire and a place for earth-tipping, but even now giving two priceless boons to Londoners, *i.e.*, visions of a wide sky and passage of free air.

Up the hill, beyond the acres on which the Co-partnership Tenants are building, the hedges are already set for the gardens of fifty-five cottages, to be shortly erected by the Improved Industrial Dwellings Co., Ltd. These cottages are to be of various sizes, with weekly rents from 6s. 6d. to 12s., each with its garden of a twelfth of an acre, already dug ready for planting by the accepted tenants. The stacks of bricks and building material lying by the road-side give evidence that these cottage suburban homes will soon be erected, and so eagerly have they been sought after, that while fifty-five

families have been accepted as tenants, 125 have had to be sent empty away.

Flats for working ladies will also be built where each lady will have accommodation, which includes her own front door or staircase, pantry, lavatory and bathroom, gas-cooker and food-cupboard, a sitting-room, and one, two, or three bedrooms. In the centre of one side of the quadrangle, which is being designed by Mr. Baillie Scott, will be a common dining-room, library, kitchen, and laundry, as well as living-rooms for the lady who, with a small staff of servants, will control and administer those apartments or organisations which will be enjoyed by the tenants in common, as well as make arrangements for the provision of such service at such prices as each working lady may require and can afford.

Along the roads already open builders have come, and some forty houses are either finished or in course of erection. Most of these have been bought by people who mean to live in them, and some are already occupied; but the chief demand of persons who wish to live in their own houses has been met, or rather, is being met, by the small company which has sprung out of the parent body, and has been called The Garden Suburb Development Co. (Hampstead), Limited, has been formed (*a*) to assist persons to build their own houses, by negotiating for them with architects, builders, and capitalists; (*b*) to group the houses in artistic relation to each other, and to the whole; and (*c*) to ensure that the work is executed in such a manner as will endure.

In order to carry out this threefold aim, the Trust has granted to the Development Company

the option over some fourteen acres of land. This land is divided into plots for those who desire cottages at £275, villas at all prices, and houses up to £1,500. Arrangements have been made with thirteen architects, who have got out plans and elevations from which would-be dwellers in the Suburb can select in accordance with their taste, requirements, and means. It would be invidious to make comparisons, and it would be impossible to mention or refer to all the plans now to be seen on the office walls, but soon those who visit the Suburb will find erected a charming old-world crescent with cottages in groups of twos and threes, designed by Mr. Geoffrey Lucas, and a pair of useful daily-to-be-lived-in-villas built upon Messrs. Joseph and Smithem's plans, while specimens of Mr. Arnold Mitchell's small homestead architecture, or evidences of Mr. Guy Dawber's, Mr. Ward's, Mr. Harrison Townsend's, Mr. Morley Horder's skill in cottage building, and Mr. Michael Bunny's larger £1,500 house, which is to be erected near the Heath, will all be seen, duly admired, and criticised.

That such a scheme as that undertaken by the Development Company of Hampstead meets a need is shown by the fact that although the Company was only registered last July, and not one penny has been spent in advertisement, it has no less than 174 clients, and many thousand pounds' worth of buildings are already ordered.

Gradually as the laying out of the Estate has grown, have ideas increasingly played round the Central Square, and even now it would be a pity to crystallise them in print. It may, though, be said that in the central square (placed on the top of the

highest of the Estate's seven little hills) will be found the sites for the churches—both Established and Free; the Institute, where all classes will, it is hoped, be drawn together by common interests; each and all improved by the four or five acres of open space, around three sides of which they will be set, the fourth side being left open to the west, where, over a sloping fore-ground of apple orchards, the old and young, the busy and idle can rejoice in space and quiet and watch the sun set over Harrow Hill, and the sky flame forth its uninterrupted glory.

So close to London, with so continuous a pressure from almost all the plot-holders for permission to cover more and even more of their land with buildings, it needs a persistent pursuance of the ideal to enable those of us who govern to keep before the tenants that our intention is not to build a suburb which will be less ugly than most suburbs, but to create a beautiful spot where all classes can dwell, united in sympathy by a common appreciation of what is natural and growing and "pleasant to the eye."

To stimulate this side of our aim a volunteer committee has been formed which, recognised by the Board, has undertaken the planting of new trees and shrubs, and the developing of interest in their care. It is not possible to set trees along any of the new roads yet (except one short one), but the beauty of the estate has been enhanced by the planting of 340 limes and lombardy and white poplars, while, as a large number of plot-holders are wishful for hedges instead of fences, the order for sweet briar, holly, yew, privet, and wild rose,

now being considered, will run, I hope, into many thousands.

It is pleasant to write with the knowledge that those who read these words will be in sympathy with what has been done, and it must be specially pleasant to "the Garden City Association" to see how some of the ideals it preaches so unflaggingly are being brought into practice. I could tell of more hopes partially realised—hopes about the school, the churches, the tea-room, the open-air swimming-bath, the hostels and Co-operative households, but this article is intended as a report of progress made, and so it shall be strictly limited to what is actually in process of accomplishment. Next year the report will, it is hoped, be longer, for, please God, more will have been achieved.

1908.

Many of these papers have been already published, and the Editors of the *Westminster Gazette*, the *Cornhill*, the *Nineteenth Century*, the *Contemporary*, and the *Independent* are thanked for the permission for their republication.

UNWIN BROTHERS, LIMITED, THE GRESHAM PRESS, WOKING AND LONDON.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

REC'D LD-URL
JUL 0 2 1986
SEP 27 1977
DISCHARGE-URL
APR 8 1978
JUL 11 1978
REC'D LD-URL
FEB 04 1988
MAY 0 4 1983
REC'D LD-URL
AUG 08 1983
ORION
LD/URL
NOV 27 '89
DEC 0 8 1989
REC'D LD-URL
MAY 8 1985
OCT 06 1986
REC'D LD-URL
JUL 0 2 19

41584

3 1158 00270 7858

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 001 194 156 4